DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 337 764 CS 010 741

TITLE	A Nationwide U.S. Survey of Classroom Teachers' and Remedial Reading Teachers' Perceptions and Knowledge about Assessment of Disabled Readers: A Quantitative Analysis.
INSTITUTION	International Reading Association, Newark, Del.
PUB DATE	91
NOTE	117p.; Prepared by the 1990-1991 International Reading Association (IRA) Disabled Reader Subcommittee.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Elementary Secondary Education; National Surveys; Reading Research; *Reading Teachers; *Remedial Reading; *Student Evaluation; *Teacher Attitudes; Test Reliability
IDENTIFIERS	Teacher Surveys; United States

ABSTRACT

A study examined classroom teachers' and remedial reading teachers' perceptions and knowledge about assessment of disabled readers. Surveys were returned by 198 teachers chosen randomly from the membership roll of the International Reading Association. Twenty-nine nonrespondents were contacted by phone and responded orally: no significant difference was found between the results of these respondents and results from the other group, and the data for both groups were combined. Results indicated: (1) fewer classroom teachers than remedial reading teachers believed they had adequate knowledge for relating assessment results to instruction; (2) fewer respondents with Bachelor's degrees than those with graduate degrees believed themselves capable of judging the adequacy of assessment instruments; (3) teachers across all categories reported always using daily informal observations with disabled readers; (4) metacognitive strategy use was most frequently specified as never being used; (5) most respondents reported much knowledge of a greater number of assessment instruments/procedures than they actually used; (6) daily informal observations, portfolios, informal reading inventories, and running records were the instruments/procedures reported as quite accurate; (7) some categories of respondents found standardized tests, end-of-level basal reader test, process-oriented assessment, and measures of amount of recreational reading to be inaccurate; and (8) respondents indicated that most (but not all) of the instruments/procedures they always use reflect the current interest in a whole language orientation to literacy instruction. (Four charts of data are included; the survey form and 81 tables of data are attached.) (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED337764

A Nationwide U.S. Survey of Classroom Teachers' and Remedial Reading Teachers' Perceptions and Knowledge about Assessment of Disabled Readers: A Quantitative Analysis

Prepared by the 1990-1991 IRA Disabled Reader Subcommittee

Sandra McCormick, Chair

Committee Members: Gary Anderson, Edwin Buettner, Robert Cooter, Barbara Fleisher, Mary Glover, Carol Hittleman, Alison Indrisano, Robert Jennings, Carol Miller, Eamonn Murtaugh, James Walker

CS010741

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sandra McCormick

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

For 1990-1991, the International Reading Association (IRA) Disabled Reader Committee received a charge from IRA's officers and board of directors to determine what teachers need to know about assessment of disabled readers. In response, a seven-section survey concerning perceptions and knowledge about assessment of disabled readers was developed by the committee. After a pilot trial with a small group of teachers (N = 31) from five states and subsequent revision of the form, the survey was distributed to 159 classroom teacher and 143 remedial reading teachers. Random selection of these teachers from IRA's membership roles produced a confidence interval of +/- 7%. The subject pool was comprised of one or more teachers from every U.S. state, although, as a result of random-selection, no non-U.S. IRA members were included. Surveys were distributed by mail and reminder postcards sent 1 week later.

Return rate was 66% (N = 198). To determine if nonrespondents differed significantly from respondents, based on the variance for the return rate 29 names were randomly drawn from the nonrespondent group. These 29 teachers were contacted by telephone and they responded orally. No significant differences between these data and those from the original respondent group were found. Subsequent to the latter finding, data from the original 198 subjects and these 29 subjects were combined for all analyses. A Cronbach alpha of .91 for the combined data of the 227 participants indicated reliability was high.

Answers to demographic-data questions showed the largest number of respondents were elementary teachers, had Masters degrees, and had 11 or more years of teaching experience. The majority taught in suburban districts having from 1,000 to 25,000 or more pupils.

Data were compared by teacher type (classroom vs. remedial reading teachers), grade level taught, last degree obtained, and number of years teaching experience. Analyses of the quantitative data produced numerous findings. Several of these are the following.

1. Statistically significantly fewer classroom teachers than remedial reading teachers believed they had adequate knowledge for relating assessment results to instruction of students with literacy problems. This also was the case for teachers holding Bachelors degrees only.

2. Statistically significantly fewer respondents with Bachelors degrees only than those with graduate degrees believed they had sufficient

knowledge for judging the adequacy of assessment instruments or procedures that have been suggested for use with disabled readers.

3. When asked to specify assessment instruments/procedures they always use with students having literacy problems, most frequently mentioned by teachers across all categories was daily informal observations; also indicated by the majority of teachers in various categories were (a) writing samples; (b) standardized reading achievement tests; (c) teacher-made diagnostic tests; and (d) literature response projects.

4. Most frequently specified as never being used were measures of metacognitive strategy use. Fifteen other instruments/procedures also were mentioned as never used by the majority of teachers in various categories analyzed.

5. When asked to specify which they are qualified to use, the majority respondents reported they had much knowledge of a sizably greater number of assessment instruments/procedures than they actually use. Based on a list of 23 instruments/procedures specified in the survey form, in relatively few cases did the majority of teachers in any category state they had no knowledge of these, but when this was the case it occurred most frequently for miscue inventories and process-oriented assessment.

6. When asked to indicate instruments/procedures they believed to be quite accurate for estimating instructional levels or for determining specific instructional needs of disabled readers, the majority of respondents specified (a) daily, informal observations; (b) portfolios; (c) informal reading inventories (IRIs); (d) running records; (e) writing samples; (f) process-oriented assessment; (g) literature response projects; (h) miscue inventories; and (i) the student's own dictated story (for assessment purposes). For determining specific instructional needs, measures of metacognitive strategy use and published diagnostic tests also were indicated. Yet, many of these were not mentioned by the majority of teachers in any category as those which they always employ. In fact, they often were noted as instruments/procedures teachers never used.

7. The majority of respondents believed most of the 23 assessment types listed in the survey form to be moderately accurate when employed with disabled readers, though use of skill sheets was considered inaccurate by many respondents both for estimating instructional levels and for determining instructional needs. Also, for specifying specific instructional needs, some categories of respondents also believed to be inaccurate: (a) standardized tests; (b) end-of-level basal reader tests; (c) process-oriented assessment; and (d) measures of amount of recreational reading.

8. Examination of instruments/procedures the majority of respondents indicated they always use, as well as those they believe to be quite accurate in assessing disabled readers, shows that most -- though not

all -- appear to reflect the current interest in a "whole-language" or "meaning-based" orientation to literacy instruction.

Other findings from the quantitative data, as well as possible implications are found in the following research report.

Two sections of the survey were comprised of open-ended questions. These qualitative data are currently being analyzed by the 1991-1992 committee and a report of these results will be submitted shortly.

A Nationwide U.S. Survey of Classroom Teachers' and Reading Teachers' Perceptions and Knowledge about Assessment of Disabled Readers: A Quantitative Analysis

There has been widespread recent interest in problems of literacy assessment. This is a particularly thorny issue when the students to be assessed have difficulties with literacy learning.

This survey was conducted in response to a charge from the International Reading Association's Board of Directors to determine what teachers need to know about the assessment of disabled readers. Classroom teachers and remedial reading teachers were surveyed.

Method

Development of the Survey Form

Items for inclusion on the data collection survey form were developed by members of the 1990-1991 Disabled Reader Committee. Questions were suggested at the annual meeting in May 1990. These questions subsequently were assembled into a survey instrument and distributed to the committee for review. After critiques and revisions, a pilot version of the survey was prepared in small booklet form.

A pilot trial of the instrument was undertaken with a representative sample of 31 classroom teachers and reading teachers. This pool included elementary, middle school, and high school teachers from five geographic locations (New York, California, Pennsylvania, Kansas, and Ohio). Responses to the pilot form were analyzed and the instrument again revised for greater clarity. Further, the internal consistency (reliability) of the pilot form was determined in order to judge whether additional revision was necessary; reliability was high -- an overall Cronbach alpha of .97, precluding the necessity of further revision. Data from the pilot survey were not included in the final analyses reported in the Results section of this document since respondents during this phase were not randomly drawn.

In its final form the survey instrument included seven sections consisting of closed-form questions (that have been submitted to quantitative analysis) and open-ended questions (for which a qualitative assessment currently is being undertaken.) Several items of demographic information also were requested. The first section of the survey dealt with teachers' perceptions; the second with tests and procedures actually used by the teachers; the third asked about tests/procedures teachers were qualified to administer; the fourth and fifth asked which tests/procedures teachers believed were most accurate in specifying students' approximate reading levels and students' strengths and weaknesses. Sections 1 through 5

included only closed-form questions. Sections 6 and 7 were comprised of open-ended questions. Section six asked teachers to specify specific questions they would like to have answered about assessment of disabled readers. In section seven, teachers were to briefly describe innovative approaches to assessment of disabled readers, if any, they were employing in their programs. Respondents were asked to provide demographic data regarding grade taught; last degree completed; years of teaching experience; and school district size and type (urban, suburban, or rural). (See Appendix A for a sample of the final version of the survey instrument.)

Sampling Plan

A random sample of classroom teachers and remedial reading teachers was drawn from IRA's membership roles. From a total pool of 16,456 members who designated themselves as classroom teachers and a total pool of 14,630 designating themselves as reading teachers, a sample of 159 and 143, respectively, was obtained, providing a confidence interval of +/- 7%. Although selection of teachers was accomplished randomly, when the subject list was examined it was found that no IRA members outside the United States were included. However, inspection of this list also showed it was comprised of one or more teachers from every U.S. state.

A number was assigned to each randomly drawn subject. Although potential respondents were ensured that their replies would remain anonymous, this was done to assist with contacting nonrespondents in a later stage.

Data Collection Procedures

Surveys were distributed by first class mail to the combined total group of 302 classroom and remedial reading teachers along with a short cover letter specifying estimated time for completion, purpose, and sponsor of the survey. Respondents were asked to return the survey in 2 1/2 weeks.

Although average return rates for mail surveys lie at about 20% - 30% (Fowler, 1984), sending follow-up postcards often increases response rate dramatically. Accordingly, 1 week after the initial mailing of the surveys, reminder postcards were mailed to all potential respondents.

Data Analysis

The overall percentage of teachers who returned the completed mail surveys was 66% (N = 198), with 64% of classroom teacher (n = 102) and 67% of remedial reading teacher (n = 96) responding.

All data from these surveys were entered onto computer spread sheets independently by two graduate students. This double data entry was undertaken to identify and eliminate typographical errors to increase

trustworthiness of the results. A Cronbach alpha of .90 indicated a high overall reliability of these survey forms.

In addition, based on the variance for the return rate, 29 names were randomly drawn from the nonrespondents, resulting in a group of 13 classroom and 16 reading teachers. These teachers were contacted by telephone and their responses to the survey questions obtained orally. This procedure was undertaken to determine if nonrespondents differed significantly from respondents. Assessment of reliability of the nonrespondent data produced a Cronbach alpha of .94. Further, inspection of the nonrespondent data indicated no significant differences between those data and those from the original respondent group. Subsequent to the latter finding, respondent data and nonrespondent data were combined and thereafter all analyses were based on a pool of 227 subjects (the original 198 respondents plus the 29 teacher who initially were nonrespondents but later responded by phone). A Cronbach alpha of .91 was obtained for the combined data.

Results

Demographics

Of the 302 teachers surveyed, there were 102 classroom teachers who responded by mail and 13 who responded as a result of follow-up telephone calls (total = 115). From the total 302 surveyed, 96 remedial reading teachers returned the mail surveys and 16 responded via the follow-up phone calls (total = 112).

Tables 1 through 5 in Appendix B present demographic data for the combined 227 respondents (115 classroom teachers and 112 remedial reading teachers) for (a) grade levels taught, (b) last degree obtained, (c) number of years teaching experience, (d) size of school district, and (e) type of school district.

As can be seen in Tables 1 - 3, the largest number of respondents were elementary school teachers (grades 1 - 5), had Masters degrees, and had 11 or more years of teaching experience.

Tables 4 and 5 indicate that the size of the school districts in which the majority of respondents taught ranged from 1,000 pupils to 25,000 or more; a relatively small number of teachers taught in districts with fewer than 1,000 pupils. The largest number of respondents worked in suburban schools. Demographic information related to size and type of school district was not considered in subsequent analyses, but all other demographic data were.

General Questions Related
to Teacher's Perceptions

Responses to seven general questions were analyzed. These questions are found under Roman numeral I. in the survey (see Appendix A).

Comparisons by teacher type. Frequencies and percentages of responses to these questions by TEACHER TYPE (classroom teachers vs. remedial reading teachers) are found in Tables 6 - 12 located in Appendix B. Data displayed in these tables indicate the following.

1. Approximately three fourths of both classroom teachers and remedial reading teachers who responded to this survey were aware of assessment instruments that can be used with disabled readers.

2. More than three fourths of both classroom teachers and remedial reading teachers were aware of assessment procedures that can be used with disabled readers.

3. Approximately two thirds of classroom teachers and three fourths of reading teachers believed more assessment is necessary with disabled readers than with students of average reading ability.

4. Nearly two thirds of classroom teachers believed assessment procedures used with disabled readers should differ from those used with average readers, while only one half of reading teachers believed this should be the case.

5. Only slightly more than one third of classroom teachers believed they had sufficient knowledge for judging the adequacy of assessment instruments that have been suggested for used with disabled readers, while one half of the reading teachers did.

6. Slightly less than one half of the classroom teachers believed they had sufficient knowledge for judging the adequacy of assessment procedures that have been suggested for use with disabled readers; approximately two thirds of reading teachers believed they had this knowledge.

7. The biggest difference seen between responses from classroom teachers and remedial reading teachers for questions asked in this section was for Question IG. This question asked, "Do you believe you have sufficient knowledge for relating assessment results to instruction of disabled readers?" Only 45% of classroom teachers responded "Yes" to this question, while 82% of remedial reading teachers said "Yes". There was a statistically significant difference between these response rates, χ^2 (2, N = 206) = 30.69, $p < .002$. For these seven general questions, this is the only

comparison between classroom teachers' and remedial reading teachers' responses that was statistically significantly different.

Comparisons by grade level. Frequencies and percentages of responses to the seven general questions by GRADE LEVEL TAUGHT (elementary, middle school, or high school) are found in Tables 13 - 19 in Appendix B. Grades 1 through 5 were designated as elementary, grades 6 through 8 as middle school, and grades 9 through 12 as high school. Statistical analyses based on data displayed in these tables indicated there were no statistically significant differences in responses based on grade levels taught (elementary vs. middle school vs. high school) for any of the seven general questions.

Comparisons by last degree obtained. Tables 20 - 26 (see Appendix B) display frequencies and percentages of responses to the seven general questions by LAST DEGREE OBTAINED (Bachelors, Masters, or Ph.D./Ed.D.). Data shown in these tables and subsequent statistical analyses indicated no significant differences by last degree obtained for Questions IA, IB, IC, or ID. However, there were statistically significant differences for Question IE, χ^2 (2, N = 221) = 22.67, $p < .000$; Question IF, χ^2 (2, N = 222) = 13.18, $p < .001$; and Question IG, χ^2 (2, N = 219) = 16.63, $p < .002$. Specifically, the following differences were found.

1. Significantly more respondents who held graduate degrees than those with Bachelors degrees only believed they had sufficient knowledge for judging the adequacy of assessment instruments and procedures that have been suggested for use with disabled readers. Of those respondents holding only Bachelors degrees, 82% believed they did not have sufficient knowledge to make these judgments. However, it should be noted that, while teachers with Masters degrees differed significantly from those with Bachelors degrees, still, a relatively large number of those with Masters degrees judged their knowledge to be insufficient in this regard (48% felt inadequate in judging instruments and 37% inadequate for judging procedures). The majority of respondents with Ph.D.s or Ed.D.s believed they could adequately make these judgments.

2. Question IG asked teachers if they believed they had sufficient knowledge for relating assessment results to instruction of disabled readers. Teachers holding Bachelors degrees differed significantly from those with graduate degrees in their responses to this question. Of the Bachelor-degree respondents, 60% said they did not have sufficient knowledge to relate assessment results to instruction. In contrast, 70% of Masters-degree respondents and 78% of Ph.D./Ed.D. respondents believed their knowledge was sufficient in this area.

Comparison by years of experience. Respondents' answers were compared by NUMBER OF YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE. Teaching experience was analyzed for four classifications: (a) those

respondents with 1 to 2 years of teaching experience; (b) those with 3 to 5 years of experience; (c) those with 6 to 10 years; and (d) those with 11 or more. See Tables 27 - 33 in Appendix B for frequencies and percentages for each of the seven general questions. Statistical analyses based on data found in these tables indicated there were no statistically significant differences in responses to the seven questions based on number of years of teaching experience.

Other. The four preceding sections examined teachers' responses by category (teacher type, grade level, degree, and experience) for purposes of statistical comparison. The present section summarizes all responses aggregated across all respondents with no statistical consideration of this categorical breakdown. Examination of the tables (Tables 6 - 33) indicates the following trends.

1. The majority of all teachers polled stated that they were aware of assessment instruments and procedures that can be used to determine instructional needs of disabled readers.

2. The majority of respondents believed more assessment is necessary with disabled readers than with students of average reading ability.

3. The majority of those responding to the survey believed assessment procedures used with disabled readers should differ from those used with average readers, though fewer remedial reading teachers than classroom teachers believed this should be the case. In addition, teachers having only 1 to 2 years of teaching experience were about equally divided on this issue, with another 20% of this latter group saying they did not know.

4. The majority of the teachers did not believe they had sufficient knowledge for judging the adequacy of assessment instruments that have been suggested for use with disabled readers, though remedial reading teachers and those with graduate degrees -- especially Ph.D.s or Ed.D.s -- felt greater confidence in their abilities to do so.

5. The majority of respondents had greater confidence in their knowledge for judging the adequacy of assessment procedures that have been suggested for use with disabled readers than they did for judging assessment instruments. However, classroom teachers, those holding Bachelors degrees only, and those with 5 years of teaching experience or less had less confidence in their abilities for this task.

6. The final question in this section asked respondents if they had sufficient knowledge for relating assessment results to instruction for disabled readers. The majority of classroom teachers, respondents holding bachelors degrees only, and those with 5 years of teaching experience or less indicated they did not have sufficient knowledge to do so. In contrast,

the majority of remedial reading teachers, those with graduate degrees -- both Masters degrees and Ph.D.s/Ed.D.s -- and those with 6 years of teaching experience or more believed they did have sufficient knowledge for this task.

Questions Related to Tests and Procedures Actually Used by Respondents

Teachers were asked to specify from a list of 23 assessment instruments/procedures those which they actually used with disabled readers. There also was an opportunity for them to specify other instruments/procedures which were not listed. This section is Roman numeral II in the survey (see Appendix A). If the respondent did not conduct any assessment of disabled readers, s/he was asked to check a blank indicating "No assessment of disabled readers occurs in my program" and was directed to omit this section of the survey.

Because there were 92 possible comparisons in this section, variance was too small to permit trustworthy statistical analysis. Therefore, descriptive data in the form of frequencies and percentages only are reported for these responses. These data are found in Tables 34- 45 located in Appendix B.

A summary of the data from these tables is in Chart 1 below. This chart lists assessment instruments/procedures specified by the majority of respondents as those which they ALWAYS, SOMETIMES, and RARELY OR NEVER use to assess students with literacy problems. When a section of this chart is left blank this indicates there was no instrument/procedure for which the majority of respondents made this specification. The chart provides a summary for four categories: (a) teacher type; (b) grade level taught; (c) last degree obtained; and (d) years of teaching experience. As can be seen from Chart 1 and from the tables in Appendix B, across all categories the assessment procedure the majority of teacher most often stated they ALWAYS used with disabled readers was daily, informal observations, while that most often indicated as RARELY OR NEVER employed was measures of metacognitive strategy use.

CHART 1

RESPONSES OF THE MAJORITY OF TEACHERS WHEN ASKED ABOUT ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS/PROCEDURES THEY ACTUALLY USE WITH DISABLED READERS

Category	Always Use	Sometimes Use	Rarely or Never Use
Classroom teachers	•Daily, informal observations •Writing samples	•Measures of amount of recreational reading	•Measures of meta-cognitive strategy use •Measures for early detection of reading difficulties •Miscue inventories
Remedial reading teachers	•Daily, informal observations •Standardized reading achievement tests		•Student's own dictated story (for assessment purposes) •End-of-level basal reader tests •Tests of background knowledge •Criterion-referenced tests •Measures of reading rate/fluency •Process-oriented assessment •Skill sheets
Elementary school teachers	•Daily, informal observations	•Retellings	
Middle school teachers	•Daily, informal observations •Standardized reading achievement tests	•Measures of reading habits, attitudes, and interest •Retellings •Measures of amount of recreational reading •Cloze tests	•Measures of meta-cognitive strategy use •Student's own dictated story (for assessment purposes) •End-of-level basal reader tests

Chart 1 (cont.)

Category	Always Use	Sometimes Use	Rarely or Never Use
		•Literature response projects	•Measures of early detection of reading difficulties •Tests of background knowledge •Miscue inventories •Portfolios •Measures of reading rate/fluency
High school teachers	•Daily, informal observations •Standardized reading achievement tests •Writing samples	•Measures of reading habits, attitudes, and interest •Retellings	•Measures of metacognitive strategy use •Student's own dictated story (for assessment purposes) •End-of-level basal reader tests •Measures for early detection of reading difficulties •Criterion-referenced tests
Bachelors degree	•Daily, informal observations •Writing samples	•Measures of reading habits, attitudes, and interest •Retellings •Measures of amount of recreational reading •Skill sheets •Informal reading inventories (IRIs)	•Measures of metacognitive strategy use •Student's own dictated story (for assessment purposes) •Miscue inventories
Masters degree	•Daily, informal observations •Writing samples		•Student's own dictated story (for assessment purposes) •Criterion-refer enced tests

Chart 1 (cont.)

Category	Always Use	Sometimes Use	Rarely or Never Use
Ph.D./Ed.D. degree	•Daily, informal observations •Teacher-made diagnostic tests	•Measures of reading habits, attitudes, and interest •Cloze tests •Published diagnostic tests •Running records •Criterion-referenced tests •Standardized reading achievement tests •Writing samples	•Measures of metacognitive strategy use •End-of-level basal reader tests •Measures for early detection of reading difficulties •Portfolios •Skill sheets •Literature response projects
1 - 2 years teaching experience	•Daily, informal observations	•Measures of amount of recreational reading •Published diagnostic tests •Skill sheets •Criterion-referenced tests	•Measures of metacognitive strategy use •Student's own dictated story (for assessment purposes) •Measures for early detection of reading difficulties •Tests of background knowledge •Miscue inventories •Portfolios •Measures of reading rate/fluency •Process-oriented assessment •Cloze tests •Retellings •Writing samples
3 - 5 years teaching experience	•Daily, informal observations	•Cloze tests	•Measures of metacognitive strategy use •Student's own dictated story (for assessment purposes)

Chart 1 (cont.)

Category	Always Use	Sometimes Use	Rarely or Never Use
			•End-of-Level basal reader tests •Measures of early detection of reading difficulties •Tests of background knowledge •Miscue inventories •Portfolios •Measures of reading rate/fluency •Process-oriented assessment •Published diagnostic tests
6 - 10 years teaching experience	•Daily, informal observations •Writing samples •Literature response projects	•Running records	•Student's own dictated story (for assessment purposes) •End-of-level basal reader tests •Criterion-referenced tests
11 or more years of teaching experience	•Daily, informal observations •Standardized reading achievement tests	•Measures of reading habits, attitudes, and interests •Retellings	•Measures of metacognitive strategy use •Tests of background knowledge

Questions Related to Tests and Procedures Respondents Believed They Were Qualified to Use

While the previous section of the survey asked respondents to specify tests and procedures they actually used, this section (Roman numeral III in the survey form) asked which they were qualified to administer. The assumption of this section was that there might be instruments/procedures, while not actually being used, that the respondents did have training and/or experience to employ with disabled readers. In addition, it was thought that comparisons of these responses with those in the previous section might provide insight regarding why teachers were or were not employing specific instruments and procedures. The same 23 items listed in section II were specified in this section (see Appendix A), again with the opportunity to indicate instruments/procedures that were not listed.

As in the preceding section, the 92 possible comparisons precluded reliable statistical analysis and therefore only frequencies and percentages for these responses are reported in Appendix B (Tables 46 - 57). Chart 2, below, summarizes these tables, providing a list of assessment instruments/procedures specified by the majority of respondents as those for which they have MUCH KNOWLEDGE, SOME KNOWLEDGE, or NO KNOWLEDGE.

CHART 2

RESPONSES OF THE MAJORITY OF TEACHERS WHEN ASKED ABOUT ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENTS/PROCEDURES THEY WERE QUALIFIED TO USE WITH DISABLED READERS

Category	No Knowledge	Some Knowledge	Much Knowledge
Classroom teachers		•Tests of background knowledge •Measures for early detection of reading difficulty •Measures of reading rate/ fluency	•End-of-level basal reader tests •Standardized reading achievement tests •IRIs •Teacher-made diagnostic tests •Writing samples •Skill sheets •Literature response projects •Daily, informal observations
Remedial reading teachers		•Student's own dictated story (for assessment purposes)	•End-of-level basal reader tests •Standardized reading achievement tests •IRIs •Published diagnostic tests •Teacher-made diagnostic tests •Writing samples •Skill sheets •Running records •Cloze tests •Daily, informal observations
Elementary school teachers		•Measures of early detection of reading difficulties •Criterion-referenced tests •Measures of reading rate/ fluency	•End-of-level basal reader tests •Standardized reading achievement tests •IRIs •Published diagnostic tests

Chart 2 (cont.)

Category	No Knowledge	Some Knowledge	Much Knowledge
			•Teacher-made diagnostic tests •Writing samples •Skill sheets •Cloze tests •Daily, informal observations
Middle school teachers		•Tests of background knowledge	•End-of-level basal reader tests •Standardized reading achievement tests •IRIs •Published diagnostic tests •Writing samples •Skill sheets •Measures of reading habits, attitudes, and interests •Literature response projects •Cloze tests •Daily, informal observations
High school teachers	•Measures for early detection of reading difficulties		•End-of-level basal reader tests •Standardized reading achievement tests •IRIs •Published diagnostic tests •Teacher-made diagnostic tests •Writing samples •Skill sheets •Measures of reading habits, attitudes, and interests •Literature response projects •Cloze tests •Daily, informal observations

Chart 2 (cont.)

Category	No Knowledge	Some Knowledge	Much Knowledge
			•Measures of reading rate/fluency •Retellings
Bachelors degree	•Miscue inventories	•Tests of background knowledge •Criterion-referenced tests •Measures of reading rate/fluency	•End-of-level basal reader tests •Standardized reading achievement tests •Writing samples •Skill sheets •Daily, informal observations
Masters degree			•End-of-level basal reader tests •Standardized reading achievement tests •IRIs •Published diagnostic tests •Teacher-made diagnostic tests •Writing samples •Skill sheets •Cloze tests •Daily, informal observations
Ph.D. or Ed.D. degree			(The majority of teachers with Ph.D.s/Ed.D.s indicated they had much knowledge of all 23 instruments/procedures listed, except use of portfolios, and measures of early detection of reading difficulties.

Chart 2 (cont.)

Category	No Knowledge	Some Knowledge	Much Knowledge
1 - 2 years experience	•Process-oriented assessment •Measures of meta-cognitive strategy use •Miscue inventories	•End-of-level basal reader tests •IRIs •Measures of amount of recreational reading •Running records •Cloze tests •Daily, informal observations •Tests of background knowledge •Retellings	
3 - 5 experience	•Process-oriented assessment •Portfolios •Measures of early detection of reading	•End-of-level basal reader tests •IRIs •Published diagnostic tests •Teacher-made diagnostic tests •Writing samples •Measures of meta-cognitive strategy use •Tests of background knowledge •Criterion-referenced tests •Miscue inventories	•Standardized reading achievement tests •Measures of amount recreational reading •Skill sheets •Literature response projects •Daily, informal observations
6 - 10 years teaching experience		•Measures of meta-cognitive strategy use •Measures of reading rate/ fluency	•End-of-level basal reader tests •Standardized reading achievement tests •IRIs •Published diagnostic tests •Teacher-made diagnostic tests •Writing samples •Measures of reading habits, attitudes, and interests

Chart 2 (cont.)

Category	No Knowledge	Some Knowledge	Much Knowledge
			•Literature response projects •Cloze tests •Daily, informal observations
11 years or more of experience			•End-of-level basal reader tests •Standardized reading achievement tests •IRIs •Published diagnostic tests •Teacher-made diagnostic tests •Writing samples •Skill sheets •Running records •Cloze tests •Daily, informal observations

As can be seen by comparing Chart 1 and Chart 2, the majority of respondents reported they had MUCH KNOWLEDGE of a sizably greater number of assessment instruments/procedures than they actually use. Thus, lack of knowledge appears not to be the factor when teachers do not employ many of these measures, but rather, other influences must come into play, for example, philosophical bias, time constraints, school district policies, questionable usefulness of currently existing measures, and the like.

Chart 2 shows that, for the classifications examined, in relatively few cases did the majority of teachers state they had NO KNOWLEDGE of the assessment measures listed, but when this was the case, it occurred most frequently for miscue inventories and process-oriented assessment.

Questions Related to the Accuracy of Tests and Procedures for Determining Instructional Levels of Disabled Readers

In section IV of the survey respondents were asked to examine the same 23 items used in sections II and III and to indicate whether they believed each measure was QUITE ACCURATE, MODERATELY

ACCURATE, or NOT ACCURATE for estimating instructional reading levels of students with literacy problems. Frequencies and percentages of these responses are found in Tables 58 - 69 in Appendix B. Data from the majority of teachers responses are summarized in Chart 3, below.

CHART 3

RESPONSES OF THE MAJORITY OF TEACHERS WHEN ASKED ABOUT THE ACCURACY OF INSTRUMENTS/PROCEDURES FOR DETERMINING INSTRUCTIONAL READING LEVELS OF DISABLED READERS

Category	Not Accurate	Moderately Accurate	Quite Accurate
Classroom teachers		• End-of-level basal reader tests • Standardized reading achievement tests • IRIs • Published diagnostic tests • Teacher-made diagnostic tests • Measures of amount of recreational reading • Running records • Measures of reading habits, attitudes, and interest • Cloze tests • Measures of metacognitive strategy use • Tests of background knowledge • Measures of early detection of reading difficulties • Criterion-referenced tests • Student's own dictated story (for assessment purposes) • Measures of reading rate/fluency • Retellings	• Writing samples • Portfolios • Daily, informal observations
Remedial reading teachers	• Skill sheets	• End-of-level basal reader tests • Standardized tests • Published diagnostic tests	• IRIs • Running records • Daily, informal observations

Chart 3 (cont.)

Category	Not Accurate	Moderately Accurate	Quite Accurate
		•Teacher-made diagnostic tests •Measures of amount of recreational reading •Writing samples •Process-oriented assessment •Measures of reading habits, attitudes and interests •Cloze tests •Measures of meta-cognitive strategy use •Tests of background knowledge •Measures of early detection of reading difficulties •Criterion-referenced tests •Student's own dictated story (for assessment purposes) •Measures of reading rate/fluency	
Elementary school teachers		•End-of-level basal reader tests •Standardized reading achievement tests •Published diagnostic tests •Teacher-made diagnostic tests •Process-oriented assessment •Measures of amount of recreational reading •Measures of reading habits, attitudes and interests •Literature response projects	•Running records •Portfolios •Daily, informal observations

Chart 3 (cont.)

Category	Not Accurate	Moderately Accurate	Quite Accurate
		•Cloze tests •Measures of meta-cognitive strategy use •Tests of background knowledge •Measures of early detection of reading difficulties •Criterion-referenced tests •Student's own dictated story (for assessment purposes) •Measures of reading rate/fluency •Retellings	
Middle school teachers	•Skill sheets	•End-of-level basal reader tests •Standardized reading achievement tests •IRIs •Published diagnostic tests •Teacher-made diagnostic tests •Process-oriented assessment •Running records •Literature response projects •Cloze tests •Measures of meta-cognitive strategy use •Tests of background knowledge •Measures of early detection of reading difficulties •Criterion-referenced tests •Student's own dictated story (for assessment purposes) •Miscue inventories	•Daily, informal observations

Chart 3 (cont.)

Category	Not Accurate	Moderately Accurate	Quite Accurate
		• Measures of reading rate/fluency • Retellings	
High school teachers		• End-of-level basal reader tests • Standardized reading achievement tests • Published diagnostic tests • Teacher-made diagnostic tests • Running records • Measures of reading habits, attitudes, and interests • Cloze tests • Measures of metacognitive strategy use • Tests of background knowledge • Measures of early detection of reading difficulties • Criterion-referenced tests • Measures of reading rate/fluency	• IRIs • Writing samples • Process-oriented assessment • Portfolios • Literature response projects • Daily, informal observations • Miscue inventories
Bachelors degree		• End-of-level basal reader tests • Standardized reading achievement tests • IRIs • Published diagnostic tests • Teacher-made diagnostic tests • Measures of amount of recreational reading • Running records • Measures of reading habits, attitudes, and interest	• Portfolios • Daily, informal observations

Chart 3 (cont.)

Category	Not Accurate	Moderately Accurate	Quite Accurate
		•Literature response projects •Cloze tests •Measures of meta-cognitive strategy use •Tests of background knowledge •Measures of early detection of reading difficulties •Criterion-referenced tests •Student's own dictated story (for assessment purposes) •Miscue inventories •Measures of reading rate/fluency •Retellings	
Masters degree	•Skill sheets	•End-of-level basal reader tests •Standardized reading achievement tests •Published diagnostic tests •Teacher-made diagnostic tests •Process-oriented assessment •Measures of amount of recreational reading •Measures of reading habits, attitudes, and interests •Literature response projects •Cloze tests •Measures of meta-cognitive strategy use •Tests of background knowledge •Measures for detection of early reading difficulties	•IRIs •Writing samples •Running records •Portfolios •Daily, informal observations

Chart 3 (cont.)

Category	Not Accurate	Moderately Accurate	Quite Accurate
		•Criterion-referenced tests •Student's own dictated story (for assessment purposes) •Measures of reading rate/fluency	
Ph.D. or Ed.D. degree	•Skill sheets	•Standardized reading achievement tests •IRIs •Published diagnostic tests •Teacher-made diagnostic tests •Writing samples •Process-oriented assessment •Measures of amount of recreational reading •Running records •Measures of reading habits, attitudes, and interests •Cloze tests •Tests of background knowledge •Measures for early detection of reading difficulties •Criterion-referenced tests •Miscue inventories •Measures of reading rate/fluency •Retellings	•Portfolios •Daily, informal observations •Student's own dictated story (for assessment purposes)
1 - 2 years experience	•Skill sheets	•End-of-level basal reader tests •IRIs •Cloze tests	•Writing samples •Portfolios •Student's own dictated story (for

Chart 3 (cont.)

Category	Not Accurate	Moderately Accurate	Quite Accurate
		•Measures of meta-cognitive strategy use •Criterion-referenced tests •Measures of reading rate/fluency •Retellings	assessment purposes)
3 - 5 years experience	•Skill sheets	•End-of-level basal reader tests •Standardized reading achievement tests •IRIs •Published diagnostic tests •Teacher-made diagnostic tests •Writing samples •Measures of reading habits, attitudes, and interests •Literature response projects •Cloze tests •Measures of early detection of reading difficulties •Criterion-referenced tests •Student's own dictated story (for assessment purposes) •Retellings	•Running records •Daily, informal observation
6 - 10 years experience		•End-of-level basal reader tests •Standardized reading, achievement tests •IRIs •Published diagnostic tests •Teacher-made diagnostic tests	•Writing samples •Portfolios •Daily, informal observations

Chart 3 (cont.)

Category	Not Accurate	Moderately Accurate	Quite Accurate
		• Process-oriented assessment • Measures of amount of recreational reading • Running records • Measures of reading habits, interests, and attitudes • Literature response projects • Cloze tests • Measures of meta-cognitive strategy use • Tests of background knowledge • Measures for early detection of reading difficulties • Criterion-referenced tests • Student's own dictated story (for assessment purposes) • Miscue inventories • Measures of reading rate/fluency	
11 or more years experience		• End-of-level basal reader tests • Standardized reading achievement tests • Published diagnostic tests • Teacher-made diagnostic tests • Process-oriented assessment • Measures of amount of recreational reading • Measures of reading habits, attitudes, and interests	• IRIs • Running records • Portfolios • Daily, informal observations

Chart 3 (cont.)

Category	Not Accurate	Moderately Accurate	Quite Accurate
		• Literature response projects • Cloze tests • Measures of meta-cognitive strategy use • Tests of background knowledge • Measures for early detection of reading difficulties • Criterion-referenced tests • Student's own dictated story (for assessment purposes) • Measures of reading rate/fluency	

As can be seen from examination of Chart 3, the majority of respondents believed the following to be QUITE ACCURATE for estimating instructional reading levels of students with literacy problems: (a) daily, informal observations; (b) portfolios; (c) IRIs; (d) running records; (e) writing samples; (f) process-oriented assessment; (g) literature response projects; (h) miscue inventories; and (i) the student's own dictated story (for assessment purposes). Yet, as shown in the previous Chart 1, many of these were not mentioned by the majority of teachers in any category as those which they ALWAYS used. In fact, they often were noted as instruments/procedures teachers NEVER used. A further comparison, with the previous Chart 2, also shows that only occasionally were any of these mentioned as instruments/procedures for which respondents had NO KNOWLEDGE. Once again, this leads to the conclusion that knowledge is not the sole determining factor of whether various types of assessment are employed in a teacher's program. It should be noted, however, that many teachers chose to indicate they had SOME KNOWLEDGE (rather than MUCH KNOWLEDGE) of these instruments/procedures, possibly indicating that more training would increase usage of these assessment types.

Of the 23 instruments/procedures listed in the survey form, there was only one that the majority of respondents in any category specified as NOT ACCURATE and that one was skill sheets.

As can be seen from the long list of tests/procedures for all categories of teachers in the middle section of Chart 3, the majority of respondents believed most of the 23 listed to be MODERATELY ACCURATE.

Questions Related to the Accuracy of Tests and Procedures for Determining Specific Instructional Needs of Disabled Readers

This section of the survey (section V) asked teachers which of the 23 items listed they believed were QUITE ACCURATE, MODERATELY ACCURATE, and NOT ACCURATE for providing insights regarding specific instructional needs of students with literacy problems. Frequencies and percentages of respondents answers for section V are found in Appendix B in Tables 70 - 81. Chart 4, below, summarizes data from these tables for the majority of teachers.

CHART 4

RESPONSES OF THE MAJORITY OF TEACHERS WHEN ASKED ABOUT THE ACCURACY OF INSTRUMENTS/PROCEDURES FOR DETERMINING SPECIFIC INSTRUCTIONAL NEEDS OF DISABLED READERS

Category	Not Accurate	Moderately Accurate	Quite Accurate
Classroom teacher		•IRIs •Published diagnostic tests •Literature response projects •Measures of metacognitive strategy use •Tests of background knowledge •Criterion-referenced tests •Student's own dictated story (for assessment purposes) •Retellings	•Running records •Portfolios •Daily, informal observations
Remedial reading teachers		•Standardized reading achievement tests •IRIs •Published diagnostic tests •Teacher-made diagnostic tests •Process-oriented assessment •Cloze tests •Tests of background knowledge •Measures for early detection of reading difficulties •Criterion-referenced tests •Measures of reading rate/fluency	•Writing samples •Running records •Daily, informal observations •Miscue inventories

Chart 4 (cont.)

Category	Not Accurate	Moderately Accurate	Quite Accurate
Elementary school teachers		•IRIs •Published diagnostic tests •Teacher-made diagnostic tests •Process-oriented assessment •Cloze tests •Literature response projects •Measures of metacognitive strategy use •Tests of background knowledge •Measures for early detection of reading difficulties •Criterion-referenced tests •Measures of reading rate/fluency	•Writing samples •Running records •Portfolios •Daily, informal observations
Middle school teachers		•Published diagnostic tests •Teacher-made diagnostic tests •Running records •Measures of reading habits, attitudes, and interests •Literature response projects •Tests of background knowledge •Student's own dictated story (for assessment purposes) •Measures of reading rate/fluency •Retellings	•Writing samples •Daily, informal observations
High school teachers	•Standardized reading achievement tests	•End-of-level basal reader tests •Published diagnostic tests	•IRIs •Writing samples •Running records •Portfolios

Chart 4 (cont.)

Category	Not Accurate	Moderately Accurate	Quite Accurate
		•Measures of meta-cognitive strategy •Criterion-referenced tests •Student's own dictated story (for (assessment purposes) •Measures of reading rate/fluency •Retellings	•Literature response projects •Daily, informal observations •Miscue inventories
Bachelors degree	•Skill sheets	•Published diagnostic tests •Teacher-made diagnostic tests •Portfolios •Measures of reading habits, attitudes, and interests •Literature response projects •Measures of meta-cognitive strategy use •Tests of background knowledge •Criterion-referenced tests •Miscue inventories •Measures of reading rate/fluency •Retellings	•Writing samples •Daily, informal observations
Masters degree		•Published diagnostic tests •Teacher-made diagnostic tests •Process-oriented assessment •Literature-response projects •Cloze tests •Tests of background knowledge •Measures for early detection of reading	•Writing samples •Running records •Portfolios •Daily, informal observations

Chart 4 (cont.)

Category	Not Accurate	Moderately Accurate	Quite Accurate
		difficulties •Criterion-referenced tests •Student's own dictated story (for assessment purposes) •Measures of reading rate/fluency •Retellings	
Ph.D. or Ed.D. degree	•Skill Sheets	•Standardized reading achievement tests •IRIs •Published diagnostic tests •Teacher-made diagnostic tests •Measures of amount of recreational reading •Cloze tests •Tests of background knowledge •Measures for early detection of reading difficulties •Criterion-referenced tests •Measures of reading rate/fluency	•Writing samples •Process-oriented assessment •Running records •Portfolios •Literature-response projects •Daily, informal observations •Measures of metacognitive strategy use •Student's own dictated story (for assessment purposes)
1 - 2 years experience	•End-of-level basal reader tests •Process-oriented assessment	•IRIs •Teacher-made diagnostic tests •Literature response projects •Measures of metacognitive strategy use •Retellings	•Writing samples •Portfolios •Daily, informal observations •Student's own dictated story (for assessment purposes)

Chart 4 (cont.)

Category	Not Accurate	Moderately Accurate	Quite Accurate
3 - 5 years experience	•Measures of amount of recreational reading •Skill sheets	•Standardized reading achievement tests •Writing samples •Measures of reading habits, attitudes, and interests •Literature-response projects •Cloze tests •Criterion-referenced tests •Retellings	•IRIs •Published diagnostic tests •Running records •Daily, informal observations
6 - 10 years experience		•End-of-level basal reader tests •IRIs •Teacher-made diagnostic tests •Process-oriented assessment •Portfolios •Measures of reading habits, attitudes and interests •Literature response projects •Measures of meta-cognitive strategy use •Tests of background knowledge •Measures for early detection of reading difficulties •Criterion-referenced tests •Student's own dictated story (for assessment purposes) •Miscue inventories •Measures of reading rate/fluency •Retellings	•Running records •Daily, informal observations

Chart 4 (cont.)

Category	Not Accurate	Moderately Accurate	Quite Accurate
11 or more years experience		•IRIs •Published diagnostic tests •Process-oriented assessment •Literature response projects •Cloze tests •Measures of metacognitive strategy use •Tests of background knowledge •Measures for early detection of reading difficulties •Criterion-referenced tests •Measures of reading rate/fluency •Retellings	•Writing samples •Portfolios •Daily, informal observations

The results displayed in Chart 4 show that assessment instruments/procedures the majority of teacher specified as QUITE ACCURATE in this section mirror rather closely those specified in the previous section (see Chart 3), with the exception that measures of metacognitive strategy use and published diagnostic tests also were mentioned as QUITE ACCURATE for determining specific instructional needs of students with literacy problems. Most tests and procedures given high points for accuracy by teachers, both in this section (Chart 4) and for estimating instructional reading levels (Chart 3) appear to reflect a "whole language" or "meaning emphasis" orientation (though this generally would not be the case with many published diagnostic tests). If one returns to Chart 1, it can be seen that instruments/procedures most often used by respondents also show this influence with the exception of use of standardized reading achievement tests. Also, in Chart 1, the summary of the data indicates that more often than not tests and procedures SOMETIMES USED by the majority of teachers would be consistent with this point of view; exceptions are: (a) skill sheets; (b) published diagnostic tests; and (c) criterion-referenced tests.

Instruments/procedures respondents in certain categories believed were NOT ACCURATE for determining specific instructional needs of disabled readers were: (a) standardized reading achievement tests; (b) skill

sheets; (c) end-of-level basal reader tests; (d) process-oriented assessment; and (e) measures of amount of recreational reading.

As in the precious section, regardless of how the data were analyzed (by teacher type; grade levels taught, etc.), respondents believed that many of the 23 instruments/procedures listed in the survey form were MODERATELY ACCURATE for providing information regarding students' specific instructional needs.

Discussion

Implications for teacher educators, school administrators, field-based supervisors, and researchers may be found in the quantitative data obtained from this survey.

It would seem that one finding in particular might have serious consequences given the General Education Initiative and the concomitant trend toward mainstreaming students with literacy problems. It is worrisome that 55% of the classroom teachers did not believe they had sufficient knowledge for relating assessment results to instruction of disabled readers. This result would imply a need for close collaboration with reading teachers, the majority (82%) of whom did feel confident of their abilities in this regard, and for inservice training for classroom teachers. That most respondents holding Bachelors degrees only (regardless of whether they were classroom teachers or remedial reading teachers) also felt a lack in this area, in addition, has implications for preservice teacher trainers.

Of equal concern is the large number of respondents who did not believe they had sufficient knowledge for judging the adequacy of assessment instruments or procedures that have been suggested for use with students having difficulties with literacy attainment. This finding also appears to be reflected in the long lists of assessment types that teachers rated as moderately accurate for estimating instructional reading levels or for determining specific instructional needs; our current data base indicates a number of those listed clearly are inaccurate for those purposes. A statistically significantly larger number of respondents with Bachelors degrees only felt this problem, but too many with Masters degrees also did. It would appear that teacher education programs at all levels should be examined closely to determine the degree to which criteria for valid and reliable assessment procedures are treated in required coursework, and to ascertain whether students in these programs are exposed to the current literature on assessment.

When examining the charts within the text regarding assessment tools and procedures teachers use, as well as those they believe to be

accurate, there seems to be some good news and some bad news. Many of those employed and/or rated highly by respondents are assessment procedures often currently recommended. On the other hand, several that the majority of respondents indicated they never use also are being advocated by many authorities and appear to have potential for assessment of disabled readers. The dichotomy between assessment types actually employed and those believed to be quite accurate is of interest and suggests further research to explain these contradictions. Are valued procedures eschewed because of insufficient training? Or for insufficient time? Or for other reasons? It is likely that from answers to these questions, teacher educators and inservice trainers could infer training program needs.

Other areas that should be addressed by research involve the actual usefulness of several recently promoted assessment tools and processes. Though logic would suggest the efficacy of these procedures, a data-base indicating their utility with learners having literacy problems is necessary for teachers to be sufficiently informed and so they can make appropriate decisions.

Unfortunately, although there has been a flurry of activity to develop better testing procedures recently, we still have no instruments or processes that are so highly valid or reliable that they can be relied upon as the sole determinants of disabled readers' instructional needs. Perhaps the tendency of respondents to this survey to rate the majority of tests/procedures specified as "moderately accurate" is an indication of their keen awareness of the limitations of all assessment types. Because the majority of teachers in all categories stated that they always used daily, informal observations to assess students, it might be wise for teacher educators to capitalize on this preferred assessment mode by helping preservice and inservice teachers learn methods of reflective and systematic observation.

Additional data may be obtained by a detailed examination of the section titled "General Questions Related to Teachers' Perceptions", the charts within the text, and the tables in Appendix B. Other information in these charts and tables than those discussed here may be informative to certain professionals. For example, a university-based educator working with undergraduates training to be classroom teachers may wish to trace the data pertaining to these categories through all charts and tables to discover specific information helpful in planning an educational program responsive to needs of this teacher group.

Limitations

Because of the sampling procedures employed in this research, it is likely that results fairly reflect perceptions and knowledge of IRA members. Still teachers who are members of this professional society are a special group. Choosing to join the International Reading Association

indicates a strong interest in literacy concerns and participation in its activities and services (e.g., attendance at conferences, reading IRA sponsored journals received as a part of the membership offerings, etc.) likely makes this group of teachers somewhat more knowledgeable than the average. Results here indicated, for example, that there were large numbers of assessment instruments/procedures for which these respondents had "some knowledge" or "much knowledge" Therefore, findings reported in this document may, in some cases, be too conservative or too exaggerated if applied to other teachers.

Again, although participants in this survey may approximate the demographic make-up of the classroom teacher and remedial reading teacher membership of IRA with some degree of accuracy, of the categories examined (teacher type, grade levels taught, last degree obtained, years of teaching experience), there were fewer respondents in four of the categories than in others. These were teachers with Ph.D.s/Ed.D.s, those with 1 - 2 years teaching experience, those with 3 - 5 years experience, and high school teachers. Data for these categories should be interpreted cautiously.

APPENDIX A

The Survey Form

RESPONDENT NO._____

ASSESSMENT OF DISABLED READERS

(Please use the marking system specified for each section. Changes in the system will prevent analysis of those responses. For example, when a numbering system is called for, please do not substitute with checkmarks, or when asked to rate as 1, 2, or 3, please do not specify as 2-3.)

I. Please check appropriate response.

A. Are you aware of assessment instruments that can be used to determine instructional needs of disabled readers?

_____ yes _____ no

B. Are you aware of assessment procedures that can be used to determine instructional needs of disabled readers?

_____ yes _____ no

C. Do you believe more assessment is necessary with disabled readers than with students of average reading ability?

_____ yes _____ no _____ don't know

D. Do you believe that assessment procedures used with disabled readers should differ from those used with average readers?

_____ yes _____ no _____ don't know

E. Do you believe you have sufficient knowledge for judging the adequacy of assessment instruments that have been suggested for use with disabled readers?

_____ yes _____ no

F. Do you believe you have sufficient knowledge for judging the adequacy of assessment procedures that have been suggested for use with disabled readers?

_____ yes _____ no

G. Do you believe you have sufficient knowledge about how to relate assessment results to instruction of disabled readers?

_____ yes _____ no

II. Which of the following do you currently use to assess disabled readers? Rate each entry as: 3 = always use; 2 = sometimes use; 1 = rarely or never use. There may be procedures listed with which you are unfamiliar; in those cases, mark 1. (If no assessment of disabled readers is conducted in your program, check here _____ and do not provide a rating in this section.)

_____ A. end-of-level basal reader tests

_____ B. standardized reading achievement tests

_____ C. informal reading inventories (IRIs)

_____ D. published diagnostic tests

_____ E. teacher-made diagnostic tests

_____ F. writing samples

_____ G. process-oriented assessment

_____ H. measures of amount of recreational reading

_____ I. skill sheets

_____ J. running records

_____ K. portfolios

_____ L. measures of reading habits, attitudes, and interests

_____ M. literature response projects

_____ N. cloze tests

_____ O. daily, informal observations

_____ P. measures of metacognitive strategy use

_____ Q. tests of background knowledge

_____ R. measures for early detection of reading difficulties

_____ S. criterion-referenced tests

_____ T. the student's own dictated story (for assessment purposes)

_____ U. miscue inventories

_____ V. measures of reading rate/fluency

_____ W. retellings

_____ X. other (specify)_____

_____ _____

_____ _____

III. Which of the following do you feel qualified to use as an assessment procedure with disabled readers? (Circle appropriate number.) Please complete this section even if you do not use the procedure. If you are unfamiliar with the procedure, circle the number for "no knowledge".

	No Knowledge	Some Knowledge	Much Knowledge
end-of-level basal reader tests	1	2	3
standardized reading achievement tests	1	2	3
informal reading inventories (IRIs)	1	2	3
published diagnostic tests	1	2	3
teacher-made diagnostic tests	1	2	3
writing samples	1	2	3
process-oriented assessment	1	2	3
measures of amount of recreational reading	1	2	3
skill sheets	1	2	3
running records	1	2	3
portfolios	1	2	3
measure of reading habits, attitudes, and interests	1	2	3
literature response projects	1	2	3
cloze tests	1	2	3
daily, informal observations	1	2	3
measures of metacognitive strategy use	1	2	3
tests of background knowledge	1	2	3
measures for early detection of reading difficulties	1	2	3
criterion-referenced tests	1	2	3

the student's own dictated story (for assessment purposes)	1	2	3
miscue inventories	1	2	3
measures of reading rate/fluency	1	2	3
retellings	1	2	3
other (specify)_____	1	2	3
_____	1	2	3
_____	1	2	3

IV. Rank each item below to indicate your beliefs regarding the degree of accuracy of each for determining instructional reading levels of disabled readers. Respond to each item as 3 = quite accurate; 2 = moderately accurate; 1 = not accurate; or X = do not know. Please respond even if you do not use the procedure. Mark X for "do not know" if you are unfamiliar with the procedure.

_____ A. end-of-level basal reader tests

_____ B. standardized reading achievement tests

_____ C. informal reading inventories (IRIs)

_____ D. published diagnostic tests

_____ E. teacher-made diagnostic tests

_____ F. writing samples

_____ G. process-oriented assessment

_____ H. measures of amount of recreational reading

_____ I. skill sheets

_____ J. running records

_____ K. portfolios

_____ L. measures of reading habits, attitudes, and interests

_____ M. literature response projects

_____ N. cloze tests

_____ O. daily, informal observations

_____ P. measures of metacognitive strategy use

_____ Q. tests of background knowledge

_____ R. measures for early detection of reading difficulties

_____ S. criterion-referenced tests

_____ T. the student's own dictated story (for assessment purposes)

_____ U. miscue inventories

_____ V. measures of reading rate/fluency

_____ W. retellings

_____ X. other (specify)_____

_____ _____

_____ _____

V. Rank each item below to indicate your beliefs regarding the degree of accuracy of each for determining specific instructional needs of disabled readers. Respond to each item as 3 = quite accurate; 2 = moderately accurate; 1 = not accurate; or X = do not know. Please respond even if you do not use the procedure. Mark X if you are unfamiliar with the procedure.

_____ A. end-of-level basal reader tests

_____ B. standardized reading achievement tests

_____ C. informal reading inventories (IRIs)

_____ D. published diagnostic tests

_____ E. teacher-made diagnostic tests

_____ F. writing samples

_____ G. process-oriented assessment

_____ H. measures of amount of recreational reading

_____ I. skill sheets

_____ J. running records

_____ K. portfolios

_____ L. measures of reading habits, attitudes, and interests

_____ M. literature response projects

_____ N. cloze tests

_____ O. daily, informal observations

_____ P. measures of metacognitive strategy use

_____ Q. tests of background knowledge

_____ R. measures for early detection of reading difficulties

_____ S. criterion-referenced tests

_____ T. the student's own dictated story (for assessment purposes.)

_____ U. miscue inventories

_____ V. measures of reading rate/fluency

_____ W. retellings

_____ X. other (specify)_____

_____ _____

_____ _____

VI. What specific question(s) would you like to have answered about assessment of disabled readers? (Attach additional sheets if you wish.)

VII. If you are using innovative approaches for assessment of disabled readers in your program, please specify/describe these here. (Attach additional sheets, if you wish.)

VIII. Current professional assignment (Check all that apply.) Please check Grade and Type.

Grade			Type
_____ 1-3	_____ 7-8	_____	Classroom teacher
_____ 4-5	_____ 9	_____	Remedial reading teacher
_____ 6	_____ 10-12		

IX. Last degree completed

_____ Bachelors _____ Masters _____ Ph.D. or Ed.D.

X. Number of years teaching experience

_____ 1-2 _____ 6-10

_____ 3-5 _____ 11 or more

XI. Number of students in school district (if known);

_____ 25,000 or more _____ 1,000 - 2,499

_____ 10,000 - 24, 999 _____ 600 - 999

_____ 5,000 - 9,999 _____ 300 - 599

_____ 2,500 - 4,999 _____ fewer than 300

XII. Type of school district (Check the one that is most applicable.)

_____ urban _____ rural

_____ suburban _____ other

* Though all respondents may return this survey without including their names, if you are using an innovative assessment approach, we would like to contact you. If you are willing to talk with a member of the IRA Disabled Readers Committee, please provide the following:

Name: _____

Telephone No.: _____

If you have any questions about this survey, please telephone:

Robert Jennings - (913) 628-4534

APPENDIX B

Tables 1 - 81

Table 1
Grade Levels Taught by the 227 Respondents

	Grade		
	1-5	6-8	6-12
Number of Respondents	111	86	13

Note: There were missing data for 17 subjects, i.e., these 17 teachers did not respond to this question.

Table 2
Last Degree Obtained by the 227 Repondents

	Degree		
	BA/BS	MA/MS	PhD./ED.D
Number of Respondents	55	160	9

Note: There were missing data for 3 subjects.

Table 3
Number of Years Teaching Experience for the 227 Respondents

	Years			
	1-2	3-5	6-10	11 or more
Number of Respondents	6	13	48	157

Note: There were missing data for 3 subjects.

Table 4

Size of School Districts in which the 227 Respondents Taught

Size of District	Number of Respondents
25,000 or more	35
10,000 - 24,999	33
5,000 - 9,999	26
2,500 - 4,999	31
1,000 - 2,499	38
600 - 999	10
300 - 599	10
Fewer than 300	9

Note: There were missing data for 35 subjects who indicated they did not know the size of their school districts.

Table 5
Type of School Districts in which the 227 Resondents Taught

	Type			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Other
Number of Respondents	52	100	53	11

Note: There were missing data for 11 subjects.

Table 6
Frequencies and Percentage of Responses to Question IA by Teacher Type

	Classroom Teachers		Remedial Reading Teachers		Both[a]	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Yes	83	76.9	75	88.2	12	92.3
No	25	23.1	10	11.8	1	7.6

Note: Question IA asked: "Are you aware of assessment instruments that can be used to determine instructional needs of disabled readers?"

Note: Total number of respondents was 227. There were missing data for 21 respondents for this question, i.e., these teachers did not respond to this question, or answered in a way that precluded analysis of their data (e.g., indicating both "Yes" and "No"; etc.) It also was not possible analyze data for this variable if the respondent did not indicate TEACHER TYPE in the demographic data section.

[a] These teachers indicated they served as both classroom teachers and as remedial reading teachers in their school districts.

Table 7
Frequencies and Percentages of Responses to Question IB by Teacher Type

	Classroom Teachers		Remedial Reading Teachers		Both	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Yes	85	78.0	75	88.2	13	100.0
No	24	22.0	10	11.8	0	0.0

Note: Question IB asked "Are you aware of assessment procedures that can be used to determine instructional needs of disabled readers?"

Note: There were missing data for 20 respondents for this question.

Table 8
Frequencies and Percentages of Responses to Question IC by Teacher Type

	Classroom Teachers		Remedial Reading Teachers		Both	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Yes	71	64.5	67	72.0	9	75.0
No	24	21.8	18	19.4	1	8.3
Don't Know	15	13.6	8	8.6	2	16.7

Note: Question 1C asked "Do you believe more assessment is necessary with disabled readers than with students of average reading ability?"

Note: There were missing data for 12 respondents for this question.

Table 9
Frequencies and Percentages of Responses to Question ID by Teacher Type

	Classroom Teachers		Remedial Reading Teachers		Both	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Yes	67	62.0	42	50.0	7	58.3
No	24	22.2	36	42.9	3	25.0
Don't Know	17	15.7	6	7.1	2	16.7

Note: Question 1D asked "Do you believe assessment procedures used with disabled readers should differ from those used with average readers?"

Note: There were missing data for 23 respondents for this question.

Table 10
Frequencies and Percentages of Responses to Question IE by Teacher Type

	Classroom Teachers		Remedial Reading Teachers		Both	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Yes	40	36.7	45	50.0	10	76.9
No	69	63.3	45	50.0	3	23.1

Note: Question 1E asked "Do you believe assessment procedures used with disabled readers should differ from those used with average readers?"

Note: There were missing data for 15 respondents for this question.

Table 11
Frequencies and Percentages of Responses to Question IF by Teacher Type

	Classroom Teachers		Remedial Reading Teachers		Both	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Yes	53	48.2	56	65.1	11	91.7
No	57	51.8	30	34.9	1	8.3

Note: Question 1F asked "Do you believe you have sufficient knowledge for judging the adequacy of assessment procedures that have been suggested for use with disabled readers?"

Note: There were missing data for 19 respondents for this question.

Table 12
Frequencies and Percentages of Responses to Question IG by Teacher Type

	Classroom Teachers		Remedial Reading Teachers		Both	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Yes	49	45.4	70	82.4	11	84.6
No	59	54.6	13	17.6	2	15.4

Note: Question 1G asked "Do you believe you have sufficient knowledge about how to relate assessment results to instruction of disabled readers?"

Note: There were missing data for 21 respondents for this question.

Table 13
Frequencies and Percentages of Responses to Question IA by Grade Level Taught

	Elementary School		Middle School		High School	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Yes	88	81.5	67	77.9	12	92.3
No	20	18.5	19	22.1	1	7.6

Note: Question 1A asked "Are you aware of assessment instruments that can be used to determine instructional needs of disabled readers?"

Note: There were missing data for 20 respondents for this question.

Table 14

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses to Question IB by Grade Level Taught

	Elementary School		Middle School		High School	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Yes	91	82.7	69	81.2	13	100.0
No	19	17.3	16	18.8	0	0.0

Note: Question 1B asked "Are you aware of assessment procedures that can be used to determine instructional needs of disabled readers?"

Note: There were missing data for 19 respondents for this question.

Table 15

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses to Question IC by Grade Level Taught

	Elementary School		Middle School		High School	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Yes	78	72.2	47	55.3	9	75.0
No	18	16.6	27	31.7	2	16.6
Don't Know	12	11.1	11	12.9	1	8.3

Note: Question 1C asked "Do you believe more assessment is neccessary with disabled readers than with students of average reading ability?"

Note: There were missing data for 22 respondents for this question.

Table 16

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses to Question ID by Grade Level Taught

	Elementary School		Middle School		High School	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Yes	64	59.8	51	60.7	7	53.8
No	30	28.0	24	28.6	5	38.5
Don't Know	13	12.1	9	10.7	1	7.7

Note: Question 1D asked "Do you believe that assessment procedures used with disabled readers should differ from those used with average readers?"

Note: There were missing data for 23 respondents for this question.

Table 17

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses to Question IE by Grade Level Taught

	Elementary School		Middle School		High School	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Yes	49	44.1	39	45.3	6	46.2
No	62	55.8	47	54.7	7	53.9

Note: Question 1E asked "Do you believe you have sufficient knowledge for judging the adequacy of assessment instruments that have been suggested for use with disabled readers?"

Note: There were missing data for 17 respondents for this question.

Table 18

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses to Question IF by Grade Level Taught

	Elementary School		Middle School		High School	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Yes	61	54.9	49	57.6	8	61.5
No	50	45.0	36	42.4	5	38.5

Note: Question 1F asked "Do you believe you have sufficient knowledge for judging the adequacy of assessment procedures that have been suggested for use with disbled readers?"

Note: There were missing data for 18 respondents for this question.

Table 19

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses to Question IG by Grade Level Taught

	Elementary School		Middle School		High School	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Yes	69	62.2	48	55.8	8	61.5
No	42	37.8	38	44.2	5	38.5

Note: Question 1G asked "Do you believe you have sufficient knowledge about how to relate assessment results to instruction of disabled readers?"

Note: There were missing data for 17 respondents for this question.

Table 20

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses to Question IA by Last Degree Obtained

	Bachelors Degree		Masters Degree		Ph.D./Ed.D Degree	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Yes	39	72.2	136	86.6	9	100.0
No	15	27.8	21	13.4	0	0.0

Note: Question 1A asked "Are you aware of assessment instruments that can be used to determine instructional needs of disabled readers?"

Note: There were missing data for 7 respondents for this question, i.e., 3 respondents did not indicate their last degree obtained and 4 did not answer this question.

Table 21

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses to Question IB by Last Degree Obtained

	Bachelors Degree		Masters Degree		Ph.D./Ed.D Degree	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Yes	40	72.7	138	87.9	9	100.0
No	15	27.3	19	12.1	0	0.0

Note: Question 1B asked "Are you aware of assessment procedures that can be used to determine instructional needs of disabled readers?"

Note: There were missing data for 6 respondents for this question.

Table 22

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses to Question IC by Last Degree Obtained

	Bachelors Degree		Masters Degree		Ph.D./Ed.D Degree	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Yes	33	61.1	111	71.6	6	66.7
No	12	22.2	31	20.0	0	0.0
Don't Know	9	16.7	13	8.4	3	33.3

Note: Question 1C asked "Do you believe more assessment is necessary with disabled readers than with students of average reading ability?"

Note: There were missing data for 9 respondents for this question.

Table 23

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses to Question ID by Last Degree Obtained

	Bachelors Degree		Masters Degree		Ph.D./Ed.D Degree	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Yes	32	61.5	87	55.8	6	66.7
No	13	25.0	50	32.1	3	33.3
Don't Know	7	13.5	19	12.2	0	0.0

Note: Question 1D asked "Do you believe that assessment procedures used with disabled readers should differ from those used with average readers?"

Note: There were missing data for 10 respondents for this question.

Table 24

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses to Question IE by Last Degree Obtained

	Bachelors Degree		Masters Degree		Ph.D./Ed.D Degree	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Yes	10	18.2	81	51.6	7	77.8
No	45	81.8	76	48.4	2	22.2

Note: Question 1E asked "Do you believe you have sufficient knowledge for judging the adequacy of assessment instruments that have been suggested for use with disabled readers?"

Note: There were missing data for 6 respondents for this question.

Table 25

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses to Question IF by Last Degree Obtained

	Bachelors Degree		Masters Degree		Ph.D./Ed.D Degree	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Yes	20	36.4	99	62.7	7	77.8
No	35	63.6	59	37.3	2	22.2

Note: Question 1F asked "Do you believe you have sufficient knowledge for juding the adequacy of assessment procedures that have been suggested for use with disabled readers?"

Note: There were missing data for 5 respondents for this question.

Table 26

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses to Question IE by Last Degree Obtained

	Bachelors Degree		Masters Degree		Ph.D./Ed.D Degree	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Yes	21	39.6	110	70.1	7	77.8
No	32	60.4	47	29.9	2	22.2

Note: Question 1G asked "Do you believe you have sufficient knowledge about how to relate assessment results to instruction of disabled readers?"

Note: There were missing data for 8 respondents for this question.

Table 27

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses to Question IA by Years of Experience

	1 - 2 Years		3 - 5 Years		6 - 10 Years		11 Years or more	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Yes	3	50.0	8	61.5	42	91.3	131	84.5
No	3	50.0	5	38.5	4	8.7	24	15.5

Note: Question 1A asked "Are you aware of assessment instruments that can be used to determine instructional needs of disabled readers?"

Note: There were missing data for 7 respondents for this question.

Table 28

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses to Question IB by Years of Experience

	1 - 2 Years		3 - 5 Years		6 - 10 Years		11 Years or more	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Yes	3	50.0	9	69.2	41	89.1	134	85.9
No	3	50.0	4	30.8	5	10.9	22	14.1

Note: Question 1B asked "Are you aware of assessment procedures that can be used to determine instructional needs of disabled readers?"

Note: There were missing data for 6 respondents for this question.

Table 29

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses to Question IC by Years of Experience

	1 - 2 Years		3 - 5 Years		6 - 10 Years		11 Years or more	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Yes	4	66.7	9	69.2	32	71.1	105	68.2
No	2	33.3	3	23.1	8	17.8	30	19.5
Don't know	0	0.0	1	7.7	5	11.1	19	12.3

Note: Question 1C asked "Do you believe more assessment is necessary with disabled readers than with students of average reading ability?"

Note: There were missing data for 9 respondents for this question.

Table 30

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses to Question ID by Years of Experience

	1 - 2 Years		3 - 5 Years		6 - 10 Years		11 Years or more	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Yes	2	40.0	8	61.5	28	60.9	87	56.9
No	2	40.0	3	23.1	11	23.9	50	32.7
Don't know	1	20.0	2	15.4	7	15.2	16	10.5

Note: Question 1D asked "Do you believe assessment procedures used with disabled readers should differ from those used with average readers?"

Note: There were missing data for 10 respondents for this question.

Table 31

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses to Question IE by Years of Experience

	1 - 2 Years		3 - 5 Years		6 - 10 Years		11 Years or more	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Yes	0	00.0	1	7.7	23	48.9	74	47.7
No	6	100.0	12	92.3	24	51.1	81	52.3

Note: Question 1E asked "Do you believe you have sufficient knowledge for judging the adequacy of assessment instruments that have been suggested for use with disabled readers?"

Note: There were missing data for 6 respondents for this question.

Table 32

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses to Question IF by Years of Experience

	1 - 2 Years		3 - 5 Years		6 - 10 Years		11 Years or more	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Yes	1	16.7	5	38.5	28	58.3	92	59.4
No	5	83.3	8	61.5	20	41.7	63	40.7

Note: Question 1F asked "Do you believe you have sufficient knowledge for judging the adequacy of assessment procedures that have been suggested for use with disabled readers?"

Note: There were missing data for 5 respondents for this question.

Table 33

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses to Question IG by Years of Experience

	1 - 2 Years		3 - 5 Years		6 - 10 Years		11 Years or more	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Yes	2	33.3	5	41.7	32	69.6	99	63.9
No	4	66.7	7	58.3	14	30.4	56	36.1

Note: Question 1G asked "Do you believe you have sufficient knowledge about how to relate assessment results to instruction of disabled readers?"

Note: There were missing data for 8 respondents for this question.

Table 34

Frequencies and Percentages of Classroom Teachers' Responses Indicating Assessment Instruments/Procedures They Actually Used with Disabled Readers

Question[a]	Always Use		Sometimes Use		Rarely or Never Use	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
II A	22	25.0	28	31.8	38	43.2
II B	35	40.2	27	31.0	25	28.7
II C	25	28.4	37	42.0	26	29.5
II D	11	12.5	31	35.2	46	52.3
II E	28	32.6	30	34.9	28	32.6
II F	46	51.7	30	33.7	13	14.6
II G	20	23.0	25	28.7	42	48.3
II H	22	24.7	47	52.8	20	22.5
II I	18	20.7	42	48.3	27	31.0
II J	26	29.9	39	44.8	22	25.3
II K	29	33.7	27	31.4	30	34.9
II L	30	34.1	38	43.2	20	22.7
II M	33	37.1	32	36.0	24	27.0
II N	8	9.2	40	46.0	39	44.8
II O	75	84.3	11	12.4	3	3.4
II P	11	12.6	24	27.6	52	59.8
II Q	16	18.4	34	39.1	37	42.5
II R	18	20.7	25	28.7	44	50.6
II S	15	17.0	31	35.2	42	47.7
II T	13	14.8	33	37.5	42	47.7
II U	11	12.5	30	34.1	47	53.4
II V	10	11.4	40	45.5	38	43.2
II W	23	26.1	44	50.0	21	23.9

Note: When Ns aggregated across a question do not total 115 (the number of classroom teacher respondents), this indicates there were missing data for this question. Also, if the respondent indicated "do not know", this was considered missing data. Furthermore, if no assessment of disabled readers occurred in a teacher's program, these respondents were invited to omit this section of the survey.

[a] The questions (which specify a specific assessment instrument/procedure) may be found under Roman numeral II of the survey form located in Appendix A.

Table 35

Frequencies and Percentages of Remedial Reading Teachers' Responses Indicating Assessment Instruments/Procedures They Actually Use with Disabled Readers

Question[a]	Always Use		Sometimes Use		Rarely or Never Use	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
II A	16	18.8	22	25.9	47	55.3
II B	53	61.6	22	25.6	11	12.8
II C	31	36.0	42	48.8	13	15.1
II D	20	23.3	39	45.3	27	31.4
II E	18	20.9	35	40.7	33	38.4
II F	35	40.7	34	39.5	17	19.8
II G	20	23.8	19	22.6	45	53.6
II H	24	28.6	28	33.3	32	38.1
II I	14	16.5	23	27.1	48	56.5
II J	34	39.5	33	38.4	19	22.1
II K	22	26.2	27	32.1	35	41.7
II L	23	26.7	43	50.0	20	23.3
II M	21	24.7	28	32.9	36	42.4
II N	12	14.1	40	47.1	33	38.8
II O	73	84.9	9	10.5	4	4.7
II P	15	17.6	32	37.6	38	44.7
II Q	12	14.1	27	31.8	46	54.1
II R	20	23.5	25	29.4	40	47.1
II S	13	15.5	29	34.5	42	50.0
II T	8	9.4	25	29.4	52	61.2
II U	11	12.9	35	41.2	39	45.9
II V	10	11.6	28	32.6	48	55.8
II W	19	22.4	41	48.2	25	29.4

Note: When Ns aggregated across a question do not total 112 (the number of remedial reading teacher respondents), this indicates there were missing data for this question.

[a] The questions (which specify a specific assessment instrument/procedure) may be found under Roman numeral II of the survey form located in Appendix A.

Table 36

Frequencies and Percentages of Elementary Teachers' Responses Indicating Assessment Instruments/Procedures They Actually Use with Disabled Readers

Question[a]	Always Use		Sometimes Use		Rarely or Never Use	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
II A	29	28.2	34	33.0	40	38.8
II B	50	49.0	30	29.4	22	21.5
II C	36	34.9	49	47.6	18	17.5
II D	18	17.5	41	39.8	44	42.7
II E	29	28.7	40	39.6	32	31.6
II F	47	45.6	35	34.0	21	20.4
II G	22	22.0	29	29.0	48	48.0
II H	26	25.5	47	46.1	28	27.5
II I	17	16.7	39	38.2	45	44.1
II J	39	38.2	40	39.2	23	22.6
II K	31	30.7	36	35.6	34	33.7
II L	33	32.0	45	43.7	25	24.3
II M	33	32.4	33	32.4	36	35.3
II N	10	10.0	47	46.5	43	42.6
II O	88	85.4	12	11.7	3	2.9
II P	19	18.6	35	34.3	48	46.6
II Q	18	17.6	37	36.3	47	46.1
II R	26	25.5	35	34.3	41	40.2
II S	15	14.7	38	37.3	49	48.0
II T	13	12.6	39	37.9	50	48.5
II U	13	12.8	43	42.6	45	44.1
II V	11	10.7	41	39.8	51	49.5
II W	26	25.2	52	50.5	24	23.3

Note: When Ns aggregated across a question do not total 111 (the number of elementary teacher respondents), this indicates there were missing data for this question.

[a] The questions (which specify a specific assessment instrument/procedure) may be found under Roman numeral II of the survey form located in Appendix A.

Table 37

Frequencies and Percentages of Middle School Teachers' Responses Indicating Assessment Instruments/Procedures They Actually Use with Disabled Readers

Question[a]	Always Use		Sometimes Use		Rarely or Never Use	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
II A	9	11.1	17	21.0	55	67.9
II B	51	62.9	23	28.0	8	9.8
II C	14	17.1	40	48.7	28	34.1
II D	29	35.8	29	35.8	23	28.4
II E	20	24.7	26	32.1	35	43.2
II F	38	45.8	33	39.8	12	14.5
II G	14	17.1	28	34.5	39	47.6
II H	16	19.5	42	51.2	23	28.1
II I	14	17.1	34	41.5	34	41.5
II J	20	24.7	29	35.8	32	39.5
II K	12	14.8	23	28.4	46	56.7
II L	17	20.7	48	58.5	17	20.7
II M	25	30.1	44	53.0	14	16.9
II N	8	9.8	42	51.2	31	37.8
II O	67	80.7	8	9.6	8	9.6
II P	5	6.1	20	24.4	57	69.5
II Q	8	9.9	32	39.5	41	50.6
II R	6	7.5	12	15.0	62	77.5
II S	26	31.7	28	34.2	28	34.2
II T	9	11.1	23	28.4	49	60.5
II U	5	6.1	17	20.7	60	73.2
II V	5	6.2	35	43.2	41	50.6
II W	12	14.8	41	50.6	28	34.6

Note: When Ns aggregated across a question do not total 86 (the number of middle school respondents), this indicates there were missing data for this question.

[a] The questions (which specify a specific assessment instrument/procedure) may be found under Roman numeral II of the survey form located in Appendix A.

Table 38

Frequencies and Percentages of High School Teachers' Responses Indicating Assessment Instruments/Procedures They Actually Use with Disabled Readers

Question[a]	Always Use		Sometimes Use		Rarely or Never Use	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
II A	1	10.0	0	0.0	9	90.0
II B	7	58.3	4	33.3	1	8.3
II C	4	33.3	4	33.3	4	33.3
II D	2	16.6	5	41.7	5	41.7
II E	3	25.0	5	41.7	4	33.3
II F	8	66.6	3	25.0	1	8.3
II G	4	36.4	2	18.2	5	45.5
II H	3	27.3	5	45.5	3	27.3
II I	2	18.2	5	45.5	4	36.4
II J	4	36.4	5	45.5	2	18.2
II K	4	44.4	3	33.3	2	22.2
II L	4	33.3	6	50.0	2	16.7
II M	5	41.6	4	33.3	3	25.0
II N	2	16.7	5	41.6	5	41.6
II O	11	91.6	1	8.3	0	0.0
II P	2	20.0	3	30.0	5	50.0
II Q	3	27.2	4	36.4	4	36.4
II R	1	9.1	2	18.2	8	72.7
II S	2	18.2	2	18.2	7	63.6
II T	1	10.0	2	20.0	7	70.0
II U	3	27.2	4	36.4	4	36.4
II V	3	27.2	4	36.4	4	36.4
II W	2	18.2	6	54.6	3	27.2

Note: When Ns aggregated across a question do not total 13 (the number of high school teacher respondents), this indicates there were missing data for this question.

[a] The questions (which specify a specific assessment instrument/procedure) may be found under Roman numeral II of the survey form located in Appendix A.

Table 39

Frequencies and Percentages of Teachers with Bachelors Degree Only Indicating Assessment Instruments/Procedures They Actually Used with Disabled Readers

Question[a]	Always Use		Sometimes Use		Rarely or Never Use	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
II A	14	31.1	9	20.0	22	48.9
II B	19	43.2	17	38.6	8	18.2
II C	10	22.2	23	51.1	12	26.7
II D	10	22.2	16	35.6	19	42.2
II E	11	25.0	16	36.4	17	38.6
II F	25	55.6	11	24.4	9	20.0
II G	8	18.2	14	31.8	22	50.0
II H	12	26.7	25	55.6	8	17.8
II I	7	15.9	23	52.3	14	31.8
II J	17	37.8	13	28.9	22	33.3
II K	11	24.4	17	37.8	17	37.8
II L	14	31.1	24	53.3	7	15.6
II M	14	31.1	21	46.7	10	22.2
II N	4	9.1	18	40.9	22	50.0
II O	40	88.9	5	11.1	0	0.0
II P	6	13.3	13	28.9	26	57.8
II Q	10	22.7	17	38.6	17	38.6
II R	8	18.2	14	31.8	22	50.0
II S	5	11.1	22	48.9	18	40.0
II T	8	17.8	13	28.9	24	53.3
II U	4	8.9	15	33.3	26	57.8
II V	6	13.3	18	40.0	21	46.7
II W	11	24.4	23	51.1	11	24.4

Note: When Ns aggregated across a question do not total 55 (the number of respondents with Bachelors degree only), this indicates there were missing data for this question.

[a] The questions (which specify a specific assessment instrument/procedure) may be found under Roman numeral II of the survey form located in Appendix A.

Table 40

Frequencies and Percentages of Teachers with Masters Degrees Indicating Assessment Instruments/Procedures They Actually Used with Disabled Readers

Question[a]	Always Use		Sometimes Use		Rarely or Never Use	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
II A	29	20.6	47	33.3	65	46.1
II B	79	54.9	34	23.6	31	21.5
II C	53	36.8	66	45.8	25	17.4
II D	27	18.9	56	39.2	60	42.0
II E	37	26.1	57	40.1	48	33.8
II F	64	44.1	55	37.9	26	17.9
II G	34	24.1	36	25.5	71	50.4
II H	36	25.4	59	41.5	47	33.1
II I	28	19.6	50	35.0	65	45.5
II J	55	39.0	59	41.8	27	19.1
II K	43	30.9	45	32.4	51	36.7
II L	42	29.2	64	44.4	38	26.4
II M	46	31.9	48	33.3	50	34.7
II N	15	10.5	68	47.6	60	42.0
II O	122	84.1	18	12.4	5	3.4
II P	23	16.3	50	35.5	68	48.2
II Q	22	15.5	48	33.8	72	50.7
II R	33	23.4	40	28.4	68	48.2
II S	26	18.3	42	29.6	74	52.1
II T	12	8.5	52	36.9	77	54.6
II U	19	13.4	57	40.1	66	46.5
II V	15	10.6	59	41.5	68	47.9
II W	34	23.9	71	50.0	37	26.1

Note: When Ns aggregated across a question do not total 160 (the number of respondents with Masters degrees), this indicates there were missing data for this question.

[a] The questions (which specify a specific assessment instrument/procedure) may be found under Roman numeral II of the survey form located in Appendix A.

Table 41
Frequencies and Percentages of Teachers with Ph.D.s or Ed.D.s Indicating Assessment Instruments/Procedures They Actually Use with Disabled Readers

Question[a]	Always Use		Sometimes Use		Rarely or Never Use	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
II A	1	11.1	0	0.0	8	88.9
II B	2	22.2	6	66.7	1	11.1
II C	3	33.3	2	22.2	4	44.4
II D	2	22.2	5	55.6	2	22.2
II E	5	55.6	2	22.2	2	22.2
II F	4	44.4	5	55.6	0	0.0
II G	3	33.3	4	44.4	2	22.2
II H	3	33.3	3	33.3	3	33.3
II I	2	22.2	2	22.2	5	55.6
II J	0	0.0	5	55.6	4	44.4
II K	2	25.0	1	12.5	5	62.5
II L	3	33.3	6	66.7	0	0.0
II M	4	44.4	0	0.0	5	55.6
II N	2	22.2	7	77.8	0	0.0
II O	7	77.8	0	0.0	2	22.2
II P	2	22.2	2	22.2	5	55.6
II Q	2	22.2	4	44.4	3	33.3
II R	1	11.1	3	33.3	5	55.6
II S	3	33.3	5	55.6	1	11.1
II T	3	33.3	2	22.2	4	44.4
II U	3	33.3	2	22.2	4	44.4
II V	2	22.2	3	33.3	4	44.4
II W	2	22.2	3	33.3	4	44.4

Note: When Ns aggregated across a question do not total 9 (the number of respondents with Ph.D.s or Ed.D.s), this indicates there were missing data for this question.

[a] The questions (which specify a specific assessment instrument/procedure) may be found under Roman numeral II of the survey form located in Appendix A.

Table 42

Frequencies and Percentages of Respondents with 1-2 Years of Teaching Experience Indicating Assessment Instruments/Procedures They Actually Use with Disabled Readers

Question[a]	Always Use		Sometimes Use		Rarely or Never Use	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
II A	1	33.3	1	33.3	1	33.3
II B	1	33.3	1	33.3	1	33.3
II C	1	33.3	1	33.3	1	33.3
II D	0	0.0	2	66.7	1	33.3
II E	1	33.3	1	33.3	1	33.3
II F	1	33.3	0	0.0	2	66.7
II G	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	100.0
II H	0	0.0	2	66.7	1	33.3
II I	0	0.0	2	66.7	1	33.3
II J	1	33.3	1	33.3	1	33.3
II K	1	33.3	0	0.0	2	66.7
II L	1	33.3	1	33.3	1	33.3
II M	1	33.3	1	33.3	1	33.3
II N	0	0.0	1	33.3	2	66.7
II O	3	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
II P	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	100.0
II Q	1	33.3	0	0.0	2	66.7
II R	1	33.3	0	0.0	2	66.7
II S	0	0.0	2	66.7	1	33.3
II T	1	33.3	0	0.0	2	66.7
II U	0	0.0	1	33.3	2	66.7
II V	0	0.0	1	33.3	2	66.7
II W	0	0.0	1	33.3	2	66.7

Note: When Ns aggregated across a question do not total 6 (the number of respondents with 1-2 years of experience), this indicates there were missing data for this question.

[a] The questions (which specify a specific assessment instrument/procedure) may be found under Roman numeral II of the survey form located in Appendix A.

Table 43

Frequencies and Percentages of Respondents with 3-5 Years of Teaching Experience Indicating Assessment Instruments/Procedures They Actually Use with Disabled Readers

Question[a]	Always Use		Sometimes Use		Rarely or Never Use	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
II A	2	16.7	2	16.7	8	66.7
II B	5	41.7	6	50.0	1	8.3
II C	3	25.0	5	41.7	4	33.3
II D	1	8.3	3	25.0	8	66.7
II E	2	16.7	4	33.3	6	50.0
II F	4	33.3	2	16.7	6	50.0
II G	2	16.7	3	25.0	7	58.3
II H	2	16.7	5	41.7	5	41.7
II I	1	8.3	6	50.0	5	41.7
II J	3	25.0	3	25.0	6	50.0
II K	1	8.3	2	16.7	9	75.0
II L	3	25.0	5	41.7	4	33.3
II M	3	25.0	6	50.0	3	25.0
II N	0	0.0	7	58.3	5	41.7
II O	9	75.0	1	8.3	2	16.7
II P	2	16.7	3	25.0	7	58.3
II Q	2	16.7	3	25.0	7	58.3
II R	0	0.0	1	8.3	11	91.7
II S	2	16.7	5	41.7	5	41.7
II T	1	8.3	2	16.7	9	75.0
II U	1	8.3	0	0.0	11	91.7
II V	1	8.3	4	33.3	7	58.3
II W	3	25.0	6	50.0	3	25.0

Note: When Ns aggregated across a question do not total 13 (the number of respondents with 3-5 years of teaching experience), this indicates there were missing data for this question.

[a] The questions (which specify a specific assessment instrument/procedure) may be found under Roman numeral II of the survey form located in Appendix A.

Table 44

Frequencies and Percentages of Respondents with 6-10 Years of Teaching Experience Indicating Assessment Instruments/Procedures They Actually Use with Disabled Readers

Question[a]	Always Use		Sometimes Use		Rarely or Never Use	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
II A	5	12.8	8	20.5	26	66.7
II B	19	47.5	9	22.5	12	30.0
II C	16	40.0	16	40.0	8	20.0
II D	8	20.0	15	37.5	17	42.5
II E	11	28.2	15	38.5	13	33.3
II F	24	60.0	12	30.0	4	10.0
II G	15	37.5	10	25.0	15	37.5
II H	15	37.5	15	37.5	10	25.0
II I	4	10.0	16	40.0	20	50.0
II J	12	30.8	20	51.3	7	17.9
II K	15	38.5	14	35.9	10	25.6
II L	19	47.5	15	37.5	6	15.0
II M	21	52.5	10	25.0	9	22.5
II N	6	15.0	19	47.5	15	37.5
II O	38	95.0	1	2.5	1	2.5
II P	9	23.7	13	34.2	16	42.1
II Q	10	25.0	18	45.0	12	30.0
II R	10	25.6	11	28.2	18	46.2
II S	5	12.5	12	30.0	23	57.5
II T	4	10.3	8	20.5	27	69.2
II U	9	23.1	15	38.5	15	38.5
II V	6	15.4	15	38.5	18	46.2
II W	14	35.0	14	35.0	12	30.0

Note: When Ns aggregated across a question do not total 48 (the number of respondents with 6-10 yeasrs teaching experience), this indicates there were missing data for this question.

[a] The questions (which specify a specific assessment instrument/procedure) may be found under Roman numeral II of the survey form located in Appendix A.

Table 45

Frequencies and Percentages of Respondents with 11 or More Years of Teaching Experience Indicating Assessment Instruments/Procedures They Actually Use with Disabled Readers

Question[a]	Always Use		Sometimes Use		Rarely or Never Use	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
II A	36	25.5	45	31.9	60	42.6
II B	75	52.8	41	28.9	26	18.3
II C	46	32.2	69	48.3	28	19.6
II D	30	21.1	57	40.1	55	38.7
II E	39	27.7	55	39.0	47	33.3
II F	64	44.4	57	39.6	23	16.0
II G	28	20.1	41	29.5	70	50.4
II H	34	24.1	65	46.1	42	29.8
II I	32	22.7	51	36.2	58	41.1
II J	56	39.7	53	37.6	32	22.7
II K	39	28.3	47	34.1	52	37.7
II L	36	25.2	73	51.0	34	23.8
II M	39	27.3	52	36.4	52	36.4
II N	15	10.6	66	46.8	60	42.6
II O	119	82.6	21	14.6	4	2.8
II P	20	14.1	49	34.5	73	51.4
II Q	21	15.0	48	34.3	71	50.7
II R	31	22.1	45	32.1	64	45.7
II S	27	19.1	50	35.5	64	45.4
II T	17	12.1	57	40.4	67	47.5
II U	16	11.3	58	40.8	68	47.9
II V	16	11.3	60	42.3	66	46.5
II W	30	21.3	76	53.9	35	24.8

Note: When Ns aggregated across a question do not total 157 (the number of respondents with 11 or more years teaching experience), this indicates there were missing data for this question.

[a] The questions (which specify a specific assessment instrument/procedure) may be found under Roman numeral II of the survey form located in Appendix A.

Table 46

Frequencies and Percentages of Classroom Teachers' Responses Indicating Instruments/Procedures They Are Qualified to Use with Disabled Readers

Question[a]	No Knowledge		Some Knowledge		Much Knowledge	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
III A	4	3.7	33	30.6	71	65.7
III B	2	1.8	36	33.0	71	65.1
III C	6	5.5	41	37.6	62	56.9
III D	13	11.9	53	48.6	43	39.4
III E	13	11.9	35	32.1	61	56.0
III F	10	9.3	34	31.5	64	59.3
III G	45	41.7	38	35.2	25	23.1
III H	9	8.3	54	49.5	46	42.2
III I	4	3.7	35	32.1	70	64.2
III J	22	20.6	43	40.2	42	39.3
III K	30	27.5	40	36.7	39	35.8
III L	10	9.2	49	45.0	50	45.9
III M	22	20.2	29	26.6	58	53.2
III N	15	13.8	44	40.4	50	45.9
III O	3	2.8	16	14.8	89	82.4
III P	47	43.5	47	43.5	14	13.0
III Q	24	22.2	58	53.7	26	24.1
III R	34	31.2	58	53.2	17	15.6
III S	22	20.2	55	50.5	32	29.4
III T	24	22.0	46	42.2	39	35.8
III U	40	36.7	44	40.4	25	22.9
III V	24	22.2	55	50.9	29	26.9
III W	13	12.0	49	45.4	46	42.6

Note: When Ns aggregated across a question do not total 115 (the number of classroom teacher respondents), this indicates there were missing data for this question.

[a] The questions may be found under Roman numeral III of the survey form located in Appendix A.

Table 47

Frequencies and Percentages of Remedial Reading Teachers' Responses Indicating Instruments/Procedures They Are Qualified to Use with Disabled Readers

Question[a]	No Knowledge		Some Knowledge		Much Knowledge	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
III A	4	4.7	20	23.3	62	72.1
III B	0	0.0	12	14.1	73	85.9
III C	2	2.3	10	11.6	74	86.0
III D	4	4.7	24	27.9	58	67.4
III E	11	12.8	28	32.6	47	54.7
III F	6	7.0	30	34.9	50	58.1
III G	33	38.8	31	36.5	21	24.7
III H	15	17.4	35	40.7	36	41.9
III I	9	10.6	29	34.1	47	55.3
III J	12	14.0	26	30.2	48	55.8
III K	21	24.7	39	45.9	25	29.4
III L	5	5.8	41	47.7	40	46.5
III M	22	25.6	27	31.4	37	43.0
III N	7	8.1	21	24.4	58	67.4
III O	1	1.2	10	11.6	75	87.2
III P	26	30.2	40	46.5	20	23.3
III Q	26	30.2	40	46.5	20	23.3
III R	24	27.9	34	39.5	28	32.6
III S	12	14.1	39	45.9	34	40.0
III T	22	25.9	44	51.8	19	22.4
III U	15	17.9	32	38.1	37	44.0
III V	18	21.2	41	48.2	26	30.6
III W	15	17.9	33	39.3	36	42.9

Note: When Ns aggregated across a question do not total 112 (the number of remedial reading teacher respondents), this indicates there were missing data for this question.

[a] The questions may be found under Roman numeral III of the survey form located in Appendix A.

Table 48

Frequencies and Percentages of Elementary School Teachers' Responses Indicating Instruments/Procedures They Are Qualified to Use with Disabled Readers

Question[a]	No Knowledge		Some Knowledge		Much Knowledge	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
III A	3	2.8	26	23.8	80	73.3
III B	1	0.9	28	25.7	80	73.3
III C	4	3.6	31	28.2	74	67.3
III D	10	9.1	43	39.1	58	52.7
III E	13	11.8	35	31.8	62	56.4
III F	10	9.2	35	32.1	64	58.7
III G	40	37.0	42	38.8	26	24.1
III H	16	14.5	49	44.5	45	40.9
III I	9	8.3	35	32.1	65	59.6
III J	19	17.4	40	36.7	50	45.9
III K	25	22.9	47	43.1	37	34.0
III L	11	10.0	50	45.5	49	44.5
III M	28	25.6	29	26.6	52	47.7
III N	12	10.9	42	38.2	56	50.9
III O	2	1.8	15	13.8	92	84.4
III P	41	37.3	50	45.5	19	17.3
III Q	27	24.8	53	48.6	29	26.6
III R	25	22.7	57	51.8	28	25.5
III S	18	16.4	57	51.8	35	31.8
III T	24	21.8	52	47.3	34	30.9
III U	26	23.8	49	45.0	34	31.2
III V	24	21.8	57	51.8	29	26.4
III W	18	16.7	46	42.6	44	40.7

Note: When Ns aggregated across a question do not total 111 (the number of elementary school teacher respondents), this indicates there were missing data for this question.

[a] The questions may be found under Roman numeral III of the survey form located in Appendix A.

Table 49
Frequencies and Percentages of Middle School Teachers' Responses Indicating Instruments/Procedures They Are Qualified to Use with Disabled Readers

Question[a]	No Knowledge		Some Knowledge		Much Knowledge	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
III A	3	3.5	36	41.9	47	54.7
III B	3	3.5	16	18.6	67	77.9
III C	3	3.5	21	24.4	62	72.1
III D	8	9.3	29	33.7	49	56.9
III E	11	12.7	36	41.8	39	45.3
III F	5	5.8	36	41.8	45	52.3
III G	34	39.5	36	41.8	16	18.6
III H	5	5.8	39	45.3	42	48.8
III I	2	2.3	29	33.7	55	63.9
III J	23	27.1	27	31.8	35	41.2
III K	29	33.7	28	32.6	29	33.7
III L	8	9.3	31	36.1	47	54.7
III M	3	3.5	34	39.5	49	56.9
III N	11	12.7	31	36.1	44	51.2
III O	0	0.0	16	18.6	70	81.4
III P	29	34.1	40	47.1	16	18.8
III Q	13	15.1	55	64.0	18	21.0
III R	41	47.6	29	33.7	16	18.6
III S	13	15.1	34	39.5	39	45.3
III T	24	27.9	36	41.8	26	30.2
III U	34	39.5	29	33.7	23	26.7
III V	16	18.8	43	50.0	27	31.8
III W	11	12.9	43	50.0	32	37.6

Note: When Ns aggregated across a question do not total 86 (the number of middle school teacher respondents), this indicates there were missing data for this question.

[a] The questions may be found under Roman numeral III of the survey form located in Appendix A.

Table 50

Frequencies and Percentages of High School Teachers' Responses Indicating Instruments/Procedures They Are Qualifed to Use with Disabled Readers

Question[a]	No Knowledge		Some Knowledge		Much Knowledge	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
III A	1	8.3	3	25.0	8	66.6
III B	1	8.3	2	16.6	9	75.0
III C	1	8.3	1	8.3	10	83.3
III D	1	8.3	4	33.3	7	58.3
III E	1	8.3	4	33.3	7	58.3
III F	0	0.0	4	33.3	8	66.6
III G	5	41.6	3	25.0	4	33.3
III H	1	8.3	5	41.6	6	50.0
III I	1	8.3	3	25.0	8	66.6
III J	2	16.6	4	33.3	6	50.0
III K	4	33.3	4	33.3	4	33.3
III L	0	0.0	5	41.6	7	58.3
III M	1	8.3	4	33.3	7	58.3
III N	1	8.3	2	16.6	9	75.0
III O	1	8.3	0	0.0	11	91.7
III P	5	41.6	3	25.0	4	33.3
III Q	4	33.3	3	25.0	5	41.6
III R	7	58.3	4	33.3	1	8.3
III S	1	9.1	5	45.5	5	45.5
III T	4	33.3	4	33.3	4	33.3
III U	4	33.3	3	25.0	5	41.6
III V	2	16.6	3	25.0	7	58.3
III W	2	16.6	2	16.6	8	66.6

Note: When Ns aggregated across a question do not total 13 (the number of high school teacher respondents), this indicates there were missing data for this question.

[a]The questions may be found under Roman numeral III of the survey form located in Appendix A.

Table 51

Frequencies and Percentages of Bachelors-Degree Teachers' Responses Indicating Instruments/Procedures They Are Qualified to Use with Disabled Readers

Question[a]	No Knowledge		Some Knowledge		Much Knowledge	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
III A	2	3.7	22	40.7	30	55.6
III B	1	1.8	17	30.9	37	67.3
III C	3	5.5	25	45.5	27	49.1
III D	9	16.4	26	47.3	20	36.4
III E	8	14.5	27	49.1	20	36.4
III F	6	10.9	20	36.4	29	52.7
III G	26	48.1	22	40.7	6	11.1
III H	6	10.9	25	45.5	24	43.6
III I	3	5.5	21	38.2	31	56.4
III J	12	22.2	23	42.6	19	35.2
III K	19	34.5	22	40.0	14	25.5
III L	5	9.1	23	41.8	27	49.1
III M	8	14.5	22	40.0	25	45.5
III N	9	16.4	20	36.4	26	47.3
III O	2	3.6	7	12.7	46	83.6
III P	24	44.4	24	44.4	6	11.1
III Q	13	23.6	34	61.8	8	14.5
III R	20	36.4	26	47.3	9	16.4
III S	9	16.4	36	65.5	10	18.2
III T	12	21.8	27	49.1	16	29.1
III U	28	50.9	17	30.9	10	18.2
III V	14	25.9	29	53.7	11	20.4
III W	10	18.5	24	44.4	20	37.0

Note: When Ns aggregated across a question do not total 55 (the number of Bachelors-degree respondents), this indicates there were missing data for this question.

[a] The questions may be found under Roman numeral III of the survey form located in Appendix A.

Table 52
Frequencies and Percentages of Masters-Degree Teachers' Responses Indicating Instruments/Procedures They Are Qualifed to Use with Disabled Readers

Question[a]	No Knowledge		Some Knowledge		Much Knowledge	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
III A	7	4.4	34	21.5	117	74.1
III B	2	1.3	35	22.3	120	76.4
III C	5	3.2	30	19.0	123	77.8
III D	9	5.7	58	36.7	91	57.6
III E	18	11.4	47	29.7	93	58.9
III F	11	7.0	55	35.0	91	58.0
III G	60	38.2	56	35.7	41	26.1
III H	23	14.6	68	43.0	67	42.4
III I	12	7.6	47	29.9	98	62.4
III J	26	16.6	53	33.8	78	49.7
III K	37	23.6	64	40.8	56	35.7
III L	13	8.2	73	46.2	72	45.6
III M	37	23.6	43	27.4	77	49.0
III N	14	8.9	60	38.0	84	53.2
III O	2	1.3	21	13.4	134	85.4
III P	55	34.8	73	46.2	30	19.0
III Q	41	26.1	72	45.9	44	28.0
III R	46	29.1	73	46.2	39	24.7
III S	27	17.2	66	42.0	64	40.8
III T	39	24.8	73	46.5	45	28.7
III U	31	19.9	70	44.9	55	35.3
III V	33	21.0	76	48.4	48	30.6
III W	24	15.5	64	41.3	67	43.2

Note: When Ns aggregated across a question do not total 160 (the number of Masters degree respondents), this indicates there were missing data for this question.

[a] The questions may be found under Roman numeral III of the survey form located in Appendix A.

Table 53

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses Teachers Having Ph.D.s or Ed.D.s Indicating Instruments/Procedures They Are Qualified to Use with Disabled Readers

Question[a]	No Knowledge		Some Knowledge		Much Knowledge	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
III A	0	0.0	4	44.4	5	55.6
III B	0	0.0	1	11.1	8	88.9
III C	0	0.0	0	0.0	9	100.0
III D	0	0.0	3	33.3	6	66.7
III E	0	0.0	1	11.1	8	88.9
III F	0	0.0	2	22.2	7	77.8
III G	1	11.1	3	33.3	5	55.6
III H	0	0.0	4	44.4	5	55.6
III I	0	0.0	3	33.3	6	66.7
III J	1	11.1	2	22.2	6	66.7
III K	2	22.2	3	33.3	4	44.4
III L	0	0.0	3	33.3	6	66.7
III M	2	22.2	0	0.0	7	77.8
III N	0	0.0	0	0.0	9	100.0
III O	0	0.0	0	0.0	9	100.0
III P	1	11.1	3	33.3	5	55.6
III Q	0	0.0	3	33.3	6	66.7
III R	1	11.1	4	44.4	4	44.4
III S	0	0.0	3	33.3	6	66.7
III T	2	22.2	0	0.0	7	77.8
III U	1	11.1	1	11.1	7	77.8
III V	0	0.0	3	33.3	6	66.7
III W	0	0.0	3	33.3	6	66.7

[a] The questions may be found under Roman numeral III of the survey form located in Appendix A.

Table 54

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses of Teachers having 1-2 Years of Experience Indicating Instruments/Procedures They Are Qualified to Use with Disabled Readers

Question[a]	No Knowledge		Some Knowledge		Much Knowledge	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
III A	0	0.0	5	83.3	1	16.7
III B	0	0.0	3	50.0	3	50.0
III C	0	0.0	4	66.7	2	33.3
III D	1	16.7	3	50.0	2	33.3
III E	1	16.7	3	50.0	2	33.3
III F	2	33.3	2	33.3	2	33.3
III G	5	83.3	1	16.7	0	0.0
III H	1	16.7	4	66.7	1	16.7
III I	0	0.0	3	50.0	3	50.0
III J	1	20.0	3	60.0	1	20.0
III K	3	50.0	2	33.3	1	16.7
III L	2	33.3	1	16.7	3	50.0
III M	1	16.7	3	50.0	2	33.3
III N	1	16.7	4	66.7	1	16.7
III O	0	0.0	4	66.7	2	33.3
III P	3	60.0	2	40.0	0	0.0
III Q	2	33.3	4	66.7	0	0.0
III R	3	50.0	2	33.3	1	16.7
III S	3	50.0	3	50.0	0	0.0
III T	2	33.3	3	50.0	1	16.7
III U	4	66.7	1	16.7	1	16.7
III V	2	40.0	1	20.0	2	40.0
III W	0	0.0	4	80.0	1	20.0

Note: When Ns aggregated across a question do not total 6 (the number of teacher respondents with 1-2 years experience), this indicates there were missing data for this question.

[a] The questions may be found under Roman numeral III of the survey form located in Appendix A.

Table 55

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses of Teachers having 3-5 Years of Experience Indicating Instruments/Procedures They Are Qualified to Use with Disabled Readers

Question[a]	No Knowledge		Some Knowledge		Much Knowledge	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
III A	1	8.3	7	58.3	4	33.3
III B	1	7.7	5	38.5	7	53.8
III C	0	0.0	8	61.5	5	38.5
III D	3	23.1	9	69.2	1	7.7
III E	2	15.4	7	53.8	4	30.8
III F	0	0.0	8	61.5	5	38.5
III G	7	58.3	2	16.7	3	25.0
III H	1	7.7	5	38.5	7	53.8
III I	1	7.7	4	30.8	8	61.5
III J	5	38.5	6	46.2	2	15.4
III K	7	53.8	6	46.2	0	0.0
III L	3	23.1	4	30.8	6	46.2
III M	1	8.3	4	33.3	7	58.3
III N	1	7.7	6	46.2	6	46.2
III O	0	0.0	3	23.1	10	76.9
III P	4	30.8	7	53.8	2	15.4
III Q	3	23.1	7	53.8	3	23.1
III R	7	53.8	6	46.2	0	0.0
III S	2	15.4	9	69.2	2	15.4
III T	3	23.1	5	38.5	5	38.5
III U	5	38.5	7	53.8	1	7.7
III V	5	38.5	6	46.2	2	15.4
III W	1	7.7	6	46.2	6	46.2

Note: When Ns aggregated across a question do not total 13 (the number of respondents with 3-5 years experience), this indicates there were missing data for this question.

[a] The questions may be found under Roman numeral III of the survey form located in Appendix A.

Table 56

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses of Teachers having 6-10 Years Experience Indicating Instruments/Procedures They Are Qualified to Use with Disabled Readers

Question[a]	No Knowledge		Some Knowledge		Much Knowledge	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
III A	3	6.3	9	18.7	36	75.0
III B	0	0.0	17	35.4	31	64.6
III C	1	2.1	12	25.0	35	72.9
III D	3	6.3	20	41.7	25	52.1
III E	4	8.3	18	37.5	26	54.2
III F	4	8.3	17	35.4	27	56.3
III G	12	25.0	22	45.8	14	29.2
III H	5	10.4	23	47.9	20	41.7
III I	3	6.3	22	45.8	23	47.9
III J	7	14.6	19	39.6	22	45.8
III K	9	18.7	22	45.8	17	35.4
III L	1	2.1	20	41.7	27	56.3
III M	12	25.0	9	18.7	27	56.3
III N	3	6.3	20	41.7	25	52.1
III O	2	4.2	5	10.4	41	85.4
III P	11	22.9	25	52.1	12	25.0
III Q	11	23.4	21	44.7	15	31.9
III R	16	33.3	23	47.9	9	18.7
III S	5	10.4	20	41.7	23	47.9
III T	11	23.4	22	46.8	14	29.8
III U	12	25.5	17	36.2	18	38.3
III V	9	19.1	26	55.3	12	25.5
III W	9	19.6	14	30.4	23	50.0

Note: When Ns aggregated across a question do not total 48 (the number of respondents with 6-10 years experience), this indicates there were missing data for this question.

[a] The questions may be found under Roman numeral III of the survey form located in Appendix A.

Table 57

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses of Teachers having 11 or More Years of Experience Indicating Instruments/Procedures They Are Qualified to Use with Disabled Readers

Question[a]	No Knowledge		Some Knowledge		Much Knowledge	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
III A	5	3.2	39	25.2	111	71.6
III B	2	1.3	28	18.2	124	80.5
III C	7	4.5	31	20.0	117	75.5
III D	11	7.1	55	35.5	89	57.4
III E	19	12.3	47	30.3	89	57.4
III F	11	7.1	50	32.5	93	60.4
III G	63	40.9	56	36.4	35	22.7
III H	22	14.2	65	41.9	68	43.9
III I	11	7.1	42	27.3	101	65.6
III J	26	16.9	50	32.5	78	50.6
III K	39	25.3	59	38.3	56	36.4
III L	12	7.7	74	47.7	69	44.5
III M	33	21.3	49	31.6	73	47.1
III N	18	11.6	50	32.3	87	56.1
III O	2	1.3	16	10.4	136	88.3
III P	62	40.0	66	42.6	27	17.4
III Q	38	24.5	77	49.7	40	25.8
III R	41	26.5	72	46.5	42	27.1
III S	26	16.9	73	47.4	55	35.7
III T	37	23.9	70	45.2	48	31.0
III U	39	25.3	63	40.9	52	33.8
III V	31	20.0	75	48.4	49	31.6
III W	24	15.6	67	43.5	63	40.9

Note: When Ns aggregated across a question do not total 157 (the number of respondents with 11 or more years of experience), this indicates there were missing data for this question.

[a] The questions may be found under Roman numeral III of the survey form located in Appendix A.

Table 58

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses of Classroom Teachers When Asked about the Accuracy of Assessment Instruments/Procedures for Estimating Instructional Levels of Disabled Readers

Question[a]	Not Accurate		Moderately Accurate		Quite Accurate	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
IV A	23	22.3	66	64.1	14	13.6
IV B	30	27.3	63	57.3	17	15.5
IV C	5	4.7	62	57.9	40	37.4
IV D	15	15.0	68	68.0	17	17.0
IV E	11	10.8	53	52.0	38	37.3
IV F	5	4.9	44	42.7	54	52.4
IV G	8	12.7	31	49.2	24	38.1
IV H	26	26.0	52	52.0	22	22.0
IV I	44	40.4	54	49.5	11	10.1
IV J	1	1.3	40	50.6	38	48.1
IV K	5	6.0	28	33.7	50	60.2
IV L	12	12.2	55	56.1	31	31.6
IV M	7	7.9	49	55.1	33	37.1
IV N	20	21.8	62	66.0	12	12.8
IV O	2	1.8	17	15.6	90	82.6
IV P	5	8.3	38	63.3	17	28.3
IV Q	18	19.1	66	70.2	10	10.6
IV R	10	12.0	51	61.4	22	26.5
IV S	26	28.9	53	58.9	11	12.2
IV T	7	7.7	53	58.2	31	34.1
IV U	15	19.5	37	48.1	25	32.5
IV V	20	22.2	55	61.1	15	16.7
IV W	9	9.5	54	56.8	32	33.7

Note: When Ns aggregated across a question do not total 115 (the number of classroom teacher respondents), this indicates there were missing data. If teachers chose to indicate "I don't know" for a question, this was considered missing data.

[a] The questions may be found under Roman numeral IV of the survey form located in Appendix A.

Table 59

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses of Remedial Reading Teachers When Asked about the Accuracy of Assessment Instruments/Procedures for Estimating Instructional Levels of Disabled Readers

Question[a]	Not Accurate		Moderately Accurate		Quite Accurate	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
IV A	17	21.3	50	62.5	13	16.3
IV B	13	15.5	58	69.0	13	15.5
IV C	0	0.0	34	41.0	49	59.0
IV D	4	5.0	52	65.0	24	30.0
IV E	3	3.9	50	65.8	23	30.3
IV F	5	6.6	39	51.3	32	42.1
IV G	4	8.2	28	57.1	17	34.7
IV H	18	25.7	40	57.1	12	17.1
IV I	49	61.3	27	33.8	4	5.0
IV J	2	2.9	27	39.1	40	58.0
IV K	4	6.5	27	43.5	31	50.0
IV L	11	14.9	45	60.8	18	24.3
IV M	8	12.9	30	48.4	24	38.7
IV N	9	11.3	53	66.3	18	22.5
IV O	1	1.2	15	17.9	68	81.0
IV P	5	10.0	27	54.0	18	36.0
IV Q	18	28.1	37	57.8	9	14.1
IV R	7	11.1	37	58.7	19	30.2
IV S	14	20.3	47	68.1	8	11.6
IV T	11	16.4	35	52.2	21	31.3
IV U	5	7.4	30	44.1	33	48.5
IV V	17	22.7	47	62.7	11	14.7
IV W	6	8.3	35	48.6	31	43.1

Note: When Ns aggregated across a question do not total 112 (the number of remedial reading teacher respondents), this indicates there were missing data. If teachers chose to indicate "I don't know" for this question, this was considered missing data.

[a] The questions may be found under Roman numeral IV of the survey form located in Appendix A.

Table 60

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses of Elementary School Teachers When Asked about the Accuracy of Assessment Instruments/Procedures for Estimating Instructional Levels of Disabled Readers

Question[a]	Not Accurate		Moderately Accurate		Quite Accurate	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
IV A	24	23.1	63	60.6	17	16.4
IV B	25	22.9	67	61.5	16	14.7
IV C	2	1.9	52	49.5	52	49.5
IV D	11	11.2	65	66.3	22	22.5
IV E	7	7.5	59	60.2	31	31.6
IV F	5	5.3	44	46.3	46	48.4
IV G	12	11.4	57	54.3	36	34.3
IV H	29	26.6	61	56.0	19	17.4
IV I	51	48.6	45	42.9	9	8.6
IV J	4	3.7	48	44.9	56	52.3
IV K	6	5.6	37	34.6	64	59.8
IV L	12	11.0	65	59.6	32	29.4
IV M	11	10.2	59	54.6	38	35.2
IV N	17	15.6	75	68.8	17	15.6
IV O	2	1.7	18	16.8	87	81.3
IV P	7	6.7	64	61.0	34	32.4
IV Q	25	23.4	70	65.4	12	11.2
IV R	10	9.3	65	60.2	33	30.6
IV S	32	29.9	63	58.3	13	12.0
IV T	10	9.3	63	58.3	34	32.0
IV U	14	13.0	54	50.0	40	37.0
IV V	23	21.3	66	61.1	19	17.6
IV W	8	8.1	53	53.5	38	38.4

Note: When Ns aggregated across a question do not total 111 (the number of elementary school teacher respondents), this indicates there were missing data. When respondents indicated "I don't know" for this question, this was considered missing data.

[a] The questions may be found under Roman numeral IV of the survey form located in Appendix A.

Table 61

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses of Middle School Teachers When Asked about the Accuracy of Assessment Instruments/Procedures for Estimating Instructional Levels of Disabled Readers

Question[a]	Not Accurate		Moderately Accurate		Quite Accurate	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
IV A	19	22.4	58	68.2	8	9.4
IV B	16	18.6	60	69.8	10	11.6
IV C	5	5.8	52	60.5	29	33.7
IV D	3	3.6	61	73.5	19	22.9
IV E	9	11.3	47	58.8	24	30.0
IV F	1	1.2	41	49.4	41	49.4
IV G	4	4.7	45	52.9	36	42.4
IV H	17	20.7	40	48.8	25	30.5
IV I	45	52.9	32	37.6	8	9.4
IV J	0	0.0	49	57.6	36	42.4
IV K	11	12.9	33	38.8	41	48.2
IV L	14	17.3	38	47.0	29	35.8
IV M	3	3.7	45	54.9	39	41.5
IV N	23	28.4	44	54.3	14	17.3
IV O	0	0.0	21	24.4	65	75.6
IV P	10	11.8	45	52.9	30	35.3
IV Q	18	22.5	53	66.3	9	11.3
IV R	10	11.8	52	61.2	23	27.1
IV S	15	18.8	44	55.0	21	26.3
IV T	6	7.7	44	56.4	28	35.9
IV U	18	21.2	45	52.9	22	25.9
IV V	14	17.1	57	69.5	11	13.4
IV W	6	7.6	45	57.0	28	35.4

Note: When Ns aggregated across a question do not total 86 (the number of middle school teacher respondents), this indicates there were missing data for this question.

[a] The questions may be found under Roman numeral IV of the survey form located in Appendix A.

Table 62

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses of High School Teachers When Asked about the Accuracy of Assessment Instruments/Procedures for Estimating Instructional Levels of Disabled Readers

Question[a]	Not Accurate		Moderately Accurate		Quite Accurate	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
IV A	1	7.7	10	76.9	2	15.4
IV B	1	8.3	8	66.6	3	25.0
IV C	1	9.1	2	18.2	8	72.7
IV D	1	9.1	6	54.5	4	36.4
IV E	0	0.0	6	54.5	5	45.5
IV F	0	0.0	5	38.5	8	61.5
IV G	0	0.0	5	45.5	6	54.5
IV H	3	27.3	5	45.5	3	27.3
IV I	6	46.2	6	46.2	1	7.7
IV J	0	0.0	7	53.8	6	46.2
IV K	0	0.0	6	46.2	7	53.8
IV L	2	16.6	8	66.6	2	16.6
IV M	0	0.0	6	46.2	7	53.8
IV N	2	18.2	7	63.6	2	18.2
IV O	0	0.0	3	23.1	10	76.9
IV P	0	0.0	7	53.8	6	46.2
IV Q	2	15.4	7	53.8	4	30.8
IV R	2	15.4	8	61.5	3	23.1
IV S	2	15.4	10	76.9	1	7.7
IV T	3	23.1	6	46.2	4	30.8
IV U	0	0.0	6	46.7	7	53.8
IV V	2	18.2	7	63.6	2	18.2
IV W	1	7.7	6	46.2	6	46.2

Note: When Ns aggregated across a question do not total 13 (the number of high school teacher respondents), this indicates there were missing data.

[a] The questions may be found under Roman numeral IV of the survey form located in Appendix A.

Table 63

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses of Teachers with Bachelors Degrees When Asked about the Accuracy of Assessment Instruments/Procedures for Estimating Instructional Levels of Disabled Readers

Question[a]	Not Accurate		Moderately Accurate		Quite Accurate	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
IV A	9	17.0	36	67.9	8	15.1
IV B	9	16.4	40	72.7	6	10.9
IV C	3	5.6	35	64.8	16	29.6
IV D	4	8.3	34	70.8	10	20.8
IV E	4	8.2	29	59.2	16	32.7
IV F	3	5.7	25	47.2	25	47.2
IV G	4	13.3	15	50.0	11	36.7
IV H	9	18.7	25	52.1	14	29.2
IV I	23	43.4	26	49.1	4	7.5
IV J	0	0.0	23	56.1	18	43.9
IV K	3	7.3	14	34.1	24	58.5
IV L	5	10.4	27	56.3	16	33.3
IV M	3	6.4	26	55.3	18	38.3
IV N	12	25.5	31	66.0	4	8.5
IV O	0	0.0	12	21.8	43	78.2
IV P	2	7.1	16	57.1	10	35.7
IV Q	9	19.6	28	60.9	9	19.6
IV R	4	10.0	22	55.0	14	35.0
IV S	10	22.2	29	64.4	6	13.3
IV T	1	2.3	22	51.2	20	46.5
IV U	9	24.3	19	51.4	9	24.3
IV V	12	26.7	25	55.6	8	17.8
IV W	2	4.8	26	61.9	14	33.3

Note: When Ns aggregated across a question do not total 55 (the number of Bachelors-degree respondents), this indicates there were missing data.

[a] The questions may be found under Roman numeral IV of the survey form located in Appendix A.

Table 64

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses of Teachers with Masters Degrees When Asked about the Accuracy of Assessment Instruments/Procedures for Estimating Instructional Levels of Disabled Readers

Question[a]	Not Accurate		Moderately Accurate		Quite Accurate	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
IV A	35	23.8	90	61.2	22	15.0
IV B	37	23.7	93	59.6	26	16.7
IV C	4	2.6	64	41.8	85	55.6
IV D	16	10.9	93	63.3	38	25.9
IV E	11	7.7	82	57.3	50	35.0
IV F	7	4.9	61	43.0	74	52.1
IV G	8	8.7	50	54.3	34	37.0
IV H	41	30.4	70	51.9	24	17.8
IV I	80	52.6	61	40.1	11	7.2
IV J	4	3.4	53	44.5	62	52.1
IV K	7	6.1	44	38.6	63	55.3
IV L	21	15.3	81	59.1	35	25.5
IV M	14	11.7	63	52.5	43	35.8
IV N	20	14.2	96	68.1	25	17.7
IV O	3	1.9	29	18.6	124	79.5
IV P	8	8.8	56	61.5	27	29.7
IV Q	31	25.0	80	64.5	13	10.5
IV R	12	10.6	70	61.9	31	27.4
IV S	37	29.1	74	58.3	16	12.6
IV T	16	13.1	74	60.7	32	26.2
IV U	12	9.9	56	46.3	53	43.8
IV V	30	22.4	82	61.2	22	16.4
IV W	13	9.6	68	50.0	55	40.4

Note: When Ns aggregated across a question do not total 160 (the number of Masters-degree respondents), this indicates there were missing data.

[a] The questions may be found under Roman numeral IV of the survey form located in Appendix A.

Table 65

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses of Teachers with Ph.D.s and Ed.D.s When Asked about the Accuracy of Assessment Instruments/Procedures for Estimating Instructional Levels of Disabled Readers

Question[a]	Not Accurate		Moderately Accurate		Quite Accurate	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
IV A	3	37.5	4	50.0	1	12.5
IV B	1	11.1	7	77.8	1	11.1
IV C	0	0.0	6	66.7	3	33.3
IV D	1	11.1	7	77.8	1	11.1
IV E	0	0.0	7	77.8	2	22.2
IV F	0	0.0	6	66.7	3	33.3
IV G	0	0.0	5	71.4	2	28.6
IV H	0	0.0	7	77.8	2	22.2
IV I	5	55.6	3	33.3	1	11.1
IV J	0	0.0	4	57.1	3	42.9
IV K	0	0.0	2	28.6	5	71.4
IV L	0	0.0	5	55.6	4	44.4
IV M	0	0.0	3	42.9	4	57.1
IV N	0	0.0	5	55.6	4	44.4
IV O	0	0.0	0	0.0	9	100.0
IV P	0	0.0	4	50.0	4	50.0
IV Q	0	0.0	8	88.9	1	11.1
IV R	1	11.1	7	77.8	1	11.1
IV S	0	0.0	7	77.8	2	22.2
IV T	1	12.5	2	25.0	5	62.5
IV U	0	0.0	6	75.0	2	25.0
IV V	0	0.0	8	88.9	1	11.1
IV W	0	0.0	5	55.6	4	44.4

Note: When Ns aggregated across a question do not total 9 (the number of Ph.D. or Ed.D.-degree respondents), this indicates there were missing data.

[a] The questions may be found under Roman numeral IV of the survey form located in Appendix A.

Table 66

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses of Teachers with 1-2 Years Experience When Asked about the Accuracy of Assessment Instruments/Procedures for Estimating Instructional Levels of Disabled Readers

Question[a]	Not Accurate		Moderately Accurate		Quite Accurate	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
IV A	1	16.7	5	83.3	0	0.0
IV B	3	50.0	3	50.0	0	0.0
IV C	0	0.0	6	100.0	0	0.0
IV D	1	25.0	2	50.0	1	25.0
IV E	1	25.0	2	50.0	1	25.0
IV F	0	0.0	1	20.0	4	80.0
IV G	1	50.0	0	0.0	1	50.0
IV H	1	25.0	1	25.0	2	50.0
IV I	4	66.7	2	33.3	0	0.0
IV J	0	0.0	2	50.0	2	50.0
IV K	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	100.0
IV L	1	25.0	1	25.0	2	50.0
IV M	1	25.0	2	50.0	1	25.0
IV N	1	20.0	3	60.0	1	20.0
IV O	0	0.0	3	50.0	3	50.0
IV P	0	0.0	2	66.7	1	33.2
IV Q	1	25.0	2	50.0	1	25.0
IV R	1	33.3	1	33.3	1	33.3
IV S	1	25.0	3	75.0	0	0.0
IV T	0	0.0	1	25.0	3	75.0
IV U	2	50.0	1	25.0	1	25.0
IV V	1	33.3	2	66.7	0	0.0
IV W	0	0.0	5	100.0	0	0.0

Note: When Ns aggregated across a question do not total 6 (the number of respondents with 1-2 years experience), this indicates there were missing data.

[a] The questions may be found under Roman numeral IV of the survey form located in Appendix A.

Table 67

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses of Teachers with 3-5 Years Experience When Asked about the Accuracy of Assessment Instruments/Procedures for Estimating Instructional Levels of Disabled Readers

Question[a]	Not Accurate		Moderately Accurate		Quite Accurate	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
IV A	3	25.0	8	66.7	1	8.3
IV B	3	23.1	8	61.5	2	15.4
IV C	1	7.7	9	69.5	3	23.1
IV D	0	0.0	6	60.0	4	40.0
IV E	1	10.0	6	60.0	3	30.0
IV F	1	8.3	9	75.0	2	16.7
IV G	2	33.3	2	33.3	2	33.3
IV H	5	50.0	3	30.0	2	20.0
IV I	8	61.5	4	30.8	1	7.7
IV J	0	0.0	2	28.6	5	71.4
IV K	2	28.6	2	28.6	3	42.9
IV L	2	22.2	5	55.6	2	22.2
IV M	1	10.0	6	60.0	3	30.0
IV N	1	8.3	11	91.7	0	0.0
IV O	0	0.0	1	8.3	11	91.7
IV P	2	28.6	3	42.9	2	28.6
IV Q	5	50.0	4	40.0	1	10.0
IV R	3	33.3	5	55.6	1	11.1
IV S	3	30.0	7	70.0	0	0.0
IV T	1	12.5	6	75.0	1	12.5
IV U	4	44.4	4	44.4	1	11.1
IV V	4	40.0	5	50.0	1	10.0
IV W	0	0.0	8	72.7	3	27.3

Note: When Ns aggregated across a question do not total 13 (the number of respondents with 3-5 years experience), this indicates there were missing data.

[a] The questions may be found under Roman numeral IV of the survey form located in Appendix A.

Table 68

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses of Teachers with 6-10 Years Experience When Asked about the Accuracy of Assessment Instruments/Procedures for Estimating Instructional Levels of Disabled Readers

Question[a]	Not Accurate		Moderately Accurate		Quite Accurate	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
IV A	14	32.6	27	62.8	2	4.7
IV B	14	30.4	26	56.5	6	13.0
IV C	1	2.2	25	54.3	20	43.5
IV D	7	16.7	25	59.5	10	23.8
IV E	4	9.1	31	70.5	9	20.5
IV F	4	9.1	16	36.4	24	54.5
IV G	1	3.0	21	63.6	11	33.3
IV H	6	14.0	28	65.1	9	20.9
IV I	22	50.0	21	47.7	1	2.3
IV J	0	0.0	22	57.9	16	42.1
IV K	1	2.9	15	42.9	19	54.3
IV L	6	13.6	27	61.4	11	25.0
IV M	3	7.9	21	55.3	14	36.8
IV N	8	18.6	28	65.1	7	16.3
IV O	0	0.0	8	17.0	39	83.0
IV P	1	3.2	19	61.3	11	35.5
IV Q	7	17.5	29	72.5	4	10.0
IV R	4	11.4	23	65.7	8	22.9
IV S	15	38.5	21	53.8	3	7.7
IV T	5	13.2	24	63.2	9	23.7
IV U	3	8.1	19	51.4	15	40.5
IV V	9	22.0	26	63.4	6	14.6
IV W	4	10.5	19	50.0	15	39.5

Note: When Ns aggregated across a question do not total 48 (the number of respondents with 6-10 years experience), this indicates there were missing data.

[a] The questions may be found under Roman numeral IV of the survey form located in Appendix A.

Table 69

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses of Teachers with 11 or More Years Experience When Asked about the Accuracy of Assessment Instruments/Procedures for Estimating Instructional Levels of Disabled Readers

Question[a]	Not Accurate		Moderately Accurate		Quite Accurate	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
IV A	29	19.7	90	61.2	28	19.0
IV B	27	17.4	103	66.5	25	16.1
IV C	5	3.3	65	43.0	81	53.6
IV D	13	8.8	101	68.2	34	23.0
IV E	9	6.3	79	55.2	55	38.5
IV F	5	3.5	66	46.2	72	50.3
IV G	8	9.1	47	53.4	33	37.5
IV H	38	28.1	70	51.9	27	20.0
IV I	74	49.0	63	41.7	14	9.3
IV J	4	3.4	54	45.8	60	50.8
IV K	7	6.0	43	37.1	66	56.9
IV L	17	12.4	80	58.4	40	29.2
IV M	12	9.8	63	51.6	47	38.5
IV N	22	16.1	90	65.7	25	18.2
IV O	3	1.9	29	18.7	123	79.4
IV P	7	8.1	52	60.5	27	31.4
IV Q	27	21.6	81	64.8	17	13.6
IV R	9	7.8	70	60.9	36	31.3
IV S	28	21.9	79	61.7	21	16.4
IV T	12	9.8	67	54.5	44	35.8
IV U	12	10.3	57	49.1	47	40.5
IV V	28	20.9	82	61.2	24	17.9
IV W	11	8.3	67	50.4	55	41.4

Note: When Ns aggregated across a question do not total 157 (the number of respondents with 11 or more years of experience), this indicates there were missing data.

[a] The questions may be found under Roman numeral IV of the survey form located in Appendix A.

Table 70

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses of Classroom Teachers When Asked about the Accuracy of Assessment Instruments/Procedures for Determining Specific Instructional Needs of Disabled Readers

Question[a]	Not Accurate		Moderately Accurate		Quite Accurate	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
V A	36	34.6	49	47.1	19	18.3
V B	47	42.7	44	40.0	19	17.3
V C	9	8.5	59	55.7	38	35.8
V D	19	18.6	55	53.9	28	27.5
V E	5	5.0	50	49.5	46	45.5
V F	11	10.7	42	40.8	50	48.5
V G	7	11.1	28	44.4	28	44.4
V H	37	36.3	50	49.0	15	14.7
V I	48	44.0	46	42.2	15	13.8
V J	5	6.5	30	39.0	42	54.5
V K	4	4.9	31	37.8	47	57.3
V L	27	26.2	49	47.6	27	26.2
V M	10	11.1	51	56.7	29	32.2
V N	33	34.7	48	50.5	14	14.7
V O	2	1.8	19	17.4	88	80.7
V P	6	10.9	31	56.4	18	32.7
V Q	20	21.7	55	59.8	17	18.5
V R	20	23.8	39	46.4	25	29.8
V S	19	20.7	59	64.1	14	15.2
V T	12	13.2	48	52.7	31	34.1
V U	14	17.5	38	47.5	28	35.0
V V	29	31.9	45	49.5	17	18.7
V W	13	14.3	50	54.9	28	30.8

Note: When Ns aggregated across a question do not total 115 (the number of classroom teacher respondents), this indicates missing data. In addition, if teachers indicated "I don't know", this was considered missing data.

[a] The questions may be found under Roman numeral V of the survey form located in Appendix A.

Table 71

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses of Remedial Reading Teachers When Asked about the Accuracy of Assessment Instruments/Procedures for Determining Specific Instructional Needs of Disabled Readers

Question[a]	Not Accurate		Moderately Accurate		Quite Accurate	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
V A	28	35.0	40	50.0	12	15.0
V B	30	35.3	48	56.5	7	8.2
V C	1	1.2	43	51.8	39	47.0
V D	9	11.3	49	61.3	22	27.5
V E	1	1.3	44	56.4	33	42.3
V F	4	5.2	27	35.1	46	59.7
V G	2	3.8	30	56.6	21	39.6
V H	32	44.4	30	41.7	10	13.9
V I	38	46.9	36	44.4	7	8.6
V J	3	4.3	30	42.9	37	52.9
V K	5	7.5	31	46.3	31	46.3
V L	23	29.5	37	47.4	18	23.1
V M	9	14.3	31	49.2	23	36.5
V N	17	21.8	42	53.8	19	24.4
V O	1	1.2	16	19.0	67	79.8
V P	4	7.5	23	43.4	26	49.1
V Q	18	26.1	35	50.7	16	23.2
V R	7	10.8	39	60.0	19	29.2
V S	16	22.2	40	55.6	16	22.2
V T	8	11.6	31	44.9	30	43.5
V U	6	9.0	26	38.8	35	52.2
V V	16	22.2	47	65.3	9	12.5
V W	7	9.6	36	49.3	30	41.1

Note: When Ns aggregated across a question do not total 112 (the number of remedial reading teacher respondents), this indicates missing data for this question. In addition, when teachers respnded "I don't know", this also was considered missing data.

[a] The questions may be found under Roman numeral V of the survey form located in Appendix A.

Table 72

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses of Elementary School Teachers When Asked about the Accuracy of Assessment Instruments/Procedures for Determining Specific Instructional Needs of Disabled Readers

Question[a]	Not Accurate		Moderately Accurate		Quite Accurate	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
V A	33	31.7	51	49.0	20	19.2
V B	43	39.5	52	47.7	14	12.8
V C	5	4.8	59	56.7	40	38.5
V D	18	16.4	61	55.5	31	28.2
V E	3	2.7	57	51.8	50	45.5
V F	9	8.2	42	38.2	59	53.6
V G	7	6.7	55	52.3	43	41.0
V H	44	40.4	50	45.9	15	13.8
V I	47	44.3	47	44.3	12	11.3
V J	7	6.5	44	41.1	56	52.3
V K	6	5.6	44	40.7	58	53.7
V L	28	25.5	54	49.1	28	25.5
V M	15	13.9	57	52.8	36	33.3
V N	30	27.5	60	55.1	19	17.4
V O	2	1.9	21	19.6	84	78.5
V P	7	6.7	54	51.4	44	41.9
V Q	25	23.2	60	55.6	23	21.3
V R	16	14.8	58	53.7	35	32.4
V S	26	23.9	64	58.7	19	17.4
V T	13	12.0	51	47.2	44	40.7
V U	13	12.0	52	48.2	43	39.8
V V	28	25.9	60	55.5	20	18.5
V W	13	12.0	54	50.0	41	38.0

Note: When Ns aggregated across a question do not total 111 (the number of elementary school respondents), this indicates missing data for this question.

[a] The questions may be found under Roman numeral V of the survey form located in Appendix A.

Table 73

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses of Middle School Teachers When Asked about the Accuracy of Assessment Instruments/Procedures for Determining Specific Instructional Needs of Disabled Readers

Question[a]	Not Accurate		Moderately Accurate		Quite Accurate	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
V A	40	46.5	34	40.0	11	12.9
V B	28	32.6	42	48.8	16	18.6
V C	13	15.1	34	39.5	39	45.4
V D	9	10.5	47	54.7	30	34.9
V E	6	7.0	55	64.0	25	29.1
V F	6	7.0	33	38.4	47	54.7
V G	10	11.8	42	49.4	33	38.8
V H	32	37.2	44	51.2	10	11.6
V I	41	49.4	30	36.1	12	14.5
V J	0	0.0	45	52.9	40	47.1
V K	7	8.1	40	46.5	39	45.4
V L	21	24.4	47	54.7	18	20.9
V M	6	7.0	53	61.6	27	31.4
V N	28	32.6	40	46.5	18	20.9
V O	0	0.0	20	23.3	66	76.7
V P	11	12.9	42	49.4	32	37.7
V Q	13	15.1	56	65.1	17	19.8
V R	20	23.5	35	41.2	30	35.3
V S	15	17.4	43	50.0	28	32.6
V T	7	8.1	44	51.2	34	39.5
V U	15	17.6	41	48.2	29	34.1
V V	27	31.4	48	55.8	11	12.8
V W	13	15.1	53	61.6	20	23.3

Note: When Ns aggregated across a question do not total 86 (the number of middle school teacher respondents), this indicates missing data for this question.

[a] The questions may be found under Roman numeral V of the survey form located in Appendix A.

Table 74

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses of High School Teachers When Asked about the Accuracy of Assessment Instruments/Procedures for Determining Specific Instructional Needs of Disabled Readers

Question[a]	Not Accurate		Moderately Accurate		Quite Accurate	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
V A	5	38.5	7	53.8	1	7.7
V B	7	58.3	4	33.3	1	8.3
V C	0	0.0	4	40.0	6	60.0
V D	2	18.2	7	63.6	2	18.2
V E	1	10.0	4	40.0	5	50.0
V F	1	8.3	4	33.3	7	58.3
V G	1	7.7	6	46.2	6	46.2
V H	3	30.0	4	40.0	3	30.0
V I	5	50.0	3	30.0	2	20.0
V J	1	10.0	3	30.0	6	60.0
V K	0	0.0	4	30.8	9	69.2
V L	4	33.3	5	41.7	3	25.0
V M	0	0.0	6	46.2	7	53.8
V N	3	30.0	5	50.0	2	20.0
V O	0	0.0	3	25.0	9	75.0
V P	0	0.0	8	61.5	5	38.5
V Q	2	20.0	4	40.0	4	40.0
V R	4	30.8	7	53.8	2	15.4
V S	2	15.4	10	76.9	1	7.7
V T	2	15.4	9	69.2	2	15.4
V U	3	23.1	3	23.1	7	53.9
V V	2	18.2	8	72.7	1	9.1
V W	0	0.0	9	69.2	4	30.8

Note: When Ns aggregated across a question do not total 13 (the number of high school teacher respondents), this indicates missing data for this question.

[a] The questions may be found under Roman numeral V of the survey form located in Appendix A.

Table 75

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses of Teachers with Bachelors Degrees When Asked about the Accuracy of Assessment Instruments/Procedures for Determining Specific Instructional Needs of Disabled Readers

Question[a]	Not Accurate		Moderately Accurate		Quite Accurate	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
V A	24	44.4	23	42.6	7	13.0
V B	22	40.0	26	47.3	7	12.7
V C	4	7.4	33	61.1	17	31.5
V D	8	16.7	29	60.4	11	22.9
V E	2	4.1	27	55.1	20	40.8
V F	3	5.9	18	35.3	30	58.8
V G	5	16.7	14	46.7	11	36.7
V H	15	31.9	22	46.8	10	21.3
V I	29	54.7	21	39.6	3	5.7
V J	2	5.0	18	45.0	20	50.0
V K	0	0.0	21	52.5	19	47.5
V L	11	22.4	26	53.1	12	24.5
V M	4	9.1	28	63.6	12	27.3
V N	18	37.5	24	50.0	6	12.5
V O	0	0.0	13	23.6	42	76.4
V P	3	11.1	18	66.7	6	22.2
V Q	9	19.6	27	58.7	10	21.7
V R	9	21.4	18	42.9	15	35.7
V S	15	31.2	29	60.4	4	8.3
V T	2	4.5	21	47.7	21	47.7
V U	7	18.9	21	56.8	9	24.3
V V	15	34.1	23	52.3	6	13.6
V W	5	12.2	23	56.1	13	31.7

Note: When Ns aggregated across a question do not total 55 (the number of Bachelors-degree respondents), this indicates missing data for this question.

[a] The questions may be found under Roman numeral V of the survey form located in Appendix A.

Table 76

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses of Teachers with Masters Degrees When Asked about the Accuracy of Assessment Instruments/Procedures for Determining Specific Instructional Needs of Disabled Readers

Question[a]	Not Accurate		Moderately Accurate		Quite Accurate	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
V A	47	32.0	73	49.7	27	18.4
V B	62	39.5	73	46.5	22	14.0
V C	8	5.3	73	48.0	71	46.7
V D	23	15.5	78	52.7	47	31.8
V E	5	3.5	73	51.0	65	45.5
V F	11	7.7	57	40.1	74	52.1
V G	4	4.2	53	55.8	38	40.0
V H	58	42.0	62	44.9	18	13.0
V I	64	42.4	66	43.7	21	13.9
V J	8	6.7	51	42.5	61	50.8
V K	9	7.5	46	38.3	65	54.2
V L	39	26.9	71	49.0	35	24.1
V M	15	12.2	64	52.0	44	35.8
V N	36	25.9	75	54.0	28	20.1
V O	3	1.9	30	19.4	122	78.7
V P	7	7.8	43	47.8	40	44.4
V Q	29	23.2	69	55.2	27	21.6
V R	17	14.8	64	55.7	34	29.6
V S	27	20.8	73	56.2	30	23.1
V T	18	14.3	68	54.0	40	31.7
V U	15	12.2	52	42.3	56	45.5
V V	34	25.6	77	57.9	22	16.5
V W	15	11.3	71	53.4	47	35.3

Note: When Ns aggregated across a question do not total 160 (the number of Masters-degree teacher respondents), this indicates missing data for this question.

[a] The questions may be found under Roman numeral V of the survey form located in Appendix A.

Table 77

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses of Teachers with Ph.D.s or Ed.D.s When Asked about the Accuracy of Assessment Instruments/Procedures for Determining Specific Instructional Needs of Disabled Readers

Question[a]	Not Accurate		Moderately Accurate		Quite Accurate	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
V A	4	50.0	3	37.5	1	12.5
V B	3	33.3	5	55.6	1	11.1
V C	1	11.1	6	66.7	2	22.2
V D	1	11.1	7	77.8	1	11.1
V E	0	0.0	6	66.7	3	33.3
V F	1	11.1	3	33.3	5	55.6
V G	0	0.0	1	14.3	6	85.7
V H	1	11.1	7	77.8	1	11.1
V I	5	55.6	3	33.3	1	11.1
V J	0	0.0	2	28.6	5	71.4
V K	0	0.0	2	28.6	5	71.4
V L	2	22.2	4	44.4	3	33.3
V M	1	12.5	1	12.5	6	75.0
V N	1	11.1	6	66.7	2	22.2
V O	0	0.0	0	0.0	9	100.0
V P	0	0.0	3	37.5	5	62.5
V Q	1	11.1	5	55.6	3	33.3
V R	1	11.1	6	66.7	2	22.2
V S	0	0.0	7	77.8	2	22.2
V T	0	0.0	3	37.5	5	62.5
V U	0	0.0	4	50.0	4	50.0
V V	1	11.1	6	66.7	2	22.2
V W	0	0.0	4	50.0	4	50.0

Note: When Ns aggregated across a question do not total 9 (the number of Ph.D./Ed.D. respondents), this indicates missing data for this question.

[a] The questions may be found under Roman numeral V of the survey form located in Appendix A.

Table 78

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses of Teachers with 1-2 Years Experience When Asked about the Accuracy of Assessment Instruments/Procedures for Determining Specific Instructional Needs of Disabled Readers

Question[a]	Not Accurate		Moderately Accurate		Quite Accurate	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
V A	4	66.7	2	33.3	0	0.0
V B	3	50.0	3	50.0	0	0.0
V C	1	16.7	4	66.7	1	16.7
V D	1	25.0	2	50.0	1	25.0
V E	0	0.0	3	75.0	1	25.0
V F	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	100.0
V G	2	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
V H	1	25.0	1	25.0	2	50.0
V I	3	50.0	2	33.3	1	16.7
V J	0	0.0	2	50.0	2	50.0
V K	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	100.0
V L	1	25.0	1	25.0	2	50.0
V M	0	0.0	2	66.7	1	33.3
V N	2	40.0	2	40.0	1	20.0
V O	0	0.0	2	33.3	4	66.7
V P	1	33.3	2	66.7	0	0.0
V Q	1	25.0	1	25.0	2	50.0
V R	1	33.3	1	33.3	1	33.3
V S	2	50.0	2	50.0	0	0.0
V T	0	0.0	1	25.0	3	75.0
V U	2	40.0	2	40.0	1	20.0
V V	1	33.3	1	33.3	1	33.3
V W	0	0.0	3	75.0	1	25.0

Note: When Ns aggregated across a question do not total 6 (the number of respondents with 1-2 years experience), this indicates missing data for this question.

[a] The questions may be found under Roman numeral V of the survey form located in Appendix A.

Table 79

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses of Teachers with 3-5 Years Experience When Asked about the Accuracy of Assessment Instruments/Procedures for Determining Specific Instructional Needs of Disabled Readers

Question[a]	Not Accurate		Moderately Accurate		Quite Accurate	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
V A	5	41.7	5	41.7	2	16.7
V B	3	23.1	8	61.5	2	15.4
V C	2	15.4	3	23.1	8	61.5
V D	1	9.1	4	36.4	6	54.5
V E	1	10.0	4	40.0	5	50.0
V F	0	0.0	8	66.7	4	33.3
V G	2	33.3	2	33.3	2	33.3
V H	7	77.8	2	22.2	0	0.0
V I	9	69.2	4	30.8	0	0.0
V J	0	0.0	1	14.3	6	85.7
V K	0	0.0	3	50.0	3	50.0
V L	3	33.3	6	66.7	0	0.0
V M	0	0.0	7	70.0	3	30.0
V N	2	16.7	7	58.3	3	25.0
V O	0	0.0	1	8.3	11	91.7
V P	2	28.6	2	28.6	3	42.9
V Q	4	40.0	5	50.0	1	10.0
V R	4	44.4	4	44.4	1	11.1
V S	2	18.2	9	81.8	0	0.0
V T	1	11.1	7	77.8	1	11.1
V U	3	33.3	4	44.4	2	22.2
V V	3	33.3	4	44.4	2	22.2
V W	2	18.2	7	63.6	2	18.2

Note: When Ns aggregated across a question do not total 13 (the number of respondents with 3-5 years experience), this indicates missing data for this question.

[a] The questions may be found under Roman numeral V of the survey form located in Appendix A.

Table 80

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses of Teachers with 6-10 Years Experience When Asked about the Accuracy of Assessment Instruments/Procedures for Determining Specific Instructional Needs of Disabled Readers

Question[a]	Not Accurate		Moderately Accurate		Quite Accurate	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
V A	18	42.9	22	52.4	2	4.8
V B	22	47.8	21	45.7	3	6.5
V C	2	4.3	26	56.5	18	39.1
V D	9	21.4	19	45.2	14	33.3
V E	2	4.5	32	72.7	10	22.7
V F	5	11.4	22	50.0	17	38.6
V G	1	3.0	18	54.5	14	42.4
V H	20	45.5	21	47.7	3	6.8
V I	22	50.0	18	40.9	4	9.1
V J	2	5.3	16	42.1	20	52.6
V K	0	0.0	19	52.8	17	47.2
V L	14	31.1	26	57.8	5	11.1
V M	5	13.2	20	52.6	13	34.2
V N	14	34.1	18	43.9	9	22.0
V O	0	0.0	11	23.9	35	76.1
V P	2	6.3	17	53.1	13	40.6
V Q	10	24.4	24	58.5	7	17.1
V R	6	17.1	21	60.0	8	22.9
V S	12	28.6	25	59.5	5	11.9
V T	6	15.8	25	65.8	7	18.4
V U	3	8.3	19	52.8	14	38.9
V V	15	36.6	24	58.5	2	4.9
V W	5	14.3	20	57.1	10	28.6

Note: When Ns aggregated across a question do not total 48 (the number of respondents with 6-10 years experience), this indicates missing data for this question.

[a] The questions may be found under Roman numeral V of the survey form located in Appendix A.

Table 81

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses of Teachers with 11 or More Years Experience When Asked about the Accuracy of Assessment Instruments/Procedures for Determining Specific Instructional Needs of Disabled Readers

Question[a]	Not Accurate		Moderately Accurate		Quite Accurate	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
V A	48	32.2	70	47.0	31	20.8
V B	59	37.8	72	46.2	25	16.0
V C	8	5.3	79	52.7	63	42.0
V D	21	14.2	89	60.1	38	25.7
V E	4	2.8	67	46.9	72	50.3
V F	10	7.0	48	33.8	84	59.2
V G	4	4.4	48	52.7	39	42.9
V H	46	33.6	67	48.9	24	17.5
V I	64	42.7	66	44.0	20	13.3
V J	8	6.8	52	44.1	58	49.2
V K	9	7.4	47	38.8	65	53.7
V L	34	23.4	68	46.9	43	29.7
V M	15	12.1	64	51.6	45	36.3
V N	37	26.8	78	56.5	23	16.7
V O	3	1.9	29	18.7	123	79.4
V P	5	6.0	43	51.8	35	42.2
V Q	24	19.2	71	56.8	30	24.0
V R	16	13.4	62	52.1	41	34.5
V S	26	20.0	73	56.2	31	23.8
V T	13	10.2	59	46.5	55	43.3
V U	14	11.9	52	44.1	52	44.1
V V	31	23.3	77	57.9	25	18.8
V W	13	9.8	68	51.5	51	38.6

Note: When Ns aggregated across a question do not total 157 (the number of respondents with 11 or more years experience), this indicates missing data for this question.

[a] The questions may be found under Roman numeral V of the survey form located in Appendix A.